

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 822

08

CE 013 466

AUTHOR Franken, Marion E.
TITLE Identifying Handicapped Students and Their Vocational Needs for 1977-1982.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 77
GRANT G007604416
NOTE 99p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Unit, Room 342, Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin--Madison, 321 Education Building, Box 49, Madison, Wisconsin 53706 (\$2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Needs; *Handicapped Students; Needs Assessment; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; Student Needs; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to identify the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective characteristics of handicapped students 14-21 years of age, and their perceived needs in the community and in future education and training in Wisconsin. A 20% sample of these students' teachers was surveyed using a mailed, machine-scoreable instrument distributed on a state-wide basis. The following are some of the major results: students were mostly male, English speaking Caucasians having intelligence quotients below 80; they were generally below level in grade placement and achievement levels in specified subject areas; and their career goals lay in the areas of agriculture, manufacturing, consumer and homemaking education, and construction. The primary handicaps were mental retardation, emotional disturbance, and learning disabilities (neurological in nature). In a vocational technical adult education institution, they would need instruction using all learning modalities in an environment restricted to a small number of students. The study concluded that training in vocational education is needed for handicapped youth and adults. Seven recommendations were made including that vocational education programs be planned and implemented for handicapped students and that higher education institutions offer and vocational teachers and student counselors take courses related to working with the handicapped. The appendix includes a list of instrument validators, participating school districts, an analysis of the reliability of the instrument, a map of the vocational-technical adult education districts in Wisconsin, and a copy of the mailed instrument. (JH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

IDENTIFYING HANDICAPPED STUDENTS
AND
THEIR VOCATIONAL NEEDS FOR 1977-1982

by

Marion E. Franken

Lloyd W. Tindall
Project P. E. P. Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wisc. Voc. Studies Ctr.
U. W. - Madison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Merle E. Strong
Director

Roger Lambert
Associate Director

Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center

University of Wisconsin--Madison

July 1977

This research conducted by Dr. Marion E. Franken, Project Associate, is one of three parts of the project entitled: *Program Evaluation and Planning* conducted under Part C, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Grant # G007604416. (Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official U.S. Office of Education position or policy.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
PREFACE	vi
CHAPTER I. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Definition of Terms	1
Sample	3
Instrumentation	4
Collection and Treatment of the Data	4
Testing of the Instrument	5
Validation	5
Reliability	6
Limitations of Data Interpretation	6
CHAPTER II. REPORT OF THE DATA	9
Demographic Data	9
Population Characteristics	9
Program Placement of Students	14
Orthopedic Impairments of Students	15
Visual Impairments of Students	19
Auditory Impairments of Students	19
Other Health Impairments of Students	24
Specific Learning Disabilities of Students	24
Speech/Language Disabilities	24
Cognitive Data	30
Types of Intelligence Tests Administered to Students	30
Year Latest Intelligence Test Was Administered	31
General Intelligence Quotients of Students	32
Grade Level Functioning of Students	32
Grade Placement of Students	35
Areas of Talent Found Among Students	35
Affective Characteristics of Students	37
Student Needs in the Community	40
Student Educational Needs	40
Awareness and Interest in Post-Secondary Offerings	40
Career Goal Perceptions, Training and Interest	42
Probable Future Educational Settings	44
Recommended Class Sizes	44
Specific Educational Needs	44
Learning Modalities	47

CHAPTER III. SUMMARIZATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	51
Review of Preceding Chapters	51
Conclusions	52
Recommendations	52
Recommendation 1	52
Recommendation 2	52
Recommendation 3	53
Recommendation 4	53
Recommendation 5	53
Recommendation 6	53
Recommendation 7	54
REFERENCES	55
APPENDICES	57
A Instrument Validators	57
B Participating Local Public School Districts From Within Wisconsin's Vocational Technical and Adult Education Districts	59
C Analysis of Reliability for Exceptional Educational Needs Identification Instrument Reliability by Question	61
D State of Wisconsin Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Districts and Full-Time Campuses	65
Copy of the Instrument	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Proportion of State Population and Study Sample of Students by Handicap Categories	7
2. Proportion of Students by Primary Handicap Categories and Sex	11
3. Proportion of Students Versus State Population Estimates by Race or Ethnic Group	12
4. Students and Their Second Language	12
5. Proportion of Public School EEN Students by Primary Handicap Categories and Age Ranges	13
6. Ages of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	14
7. Proportion of Students and Their Primary Handicaps	15
8. Secondary Handicaps of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	16
9. Type of Program in Which Students Were Enrolled by Primary Handicap Categories	17
10. Etymology of Orthopedic Disabilities of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	18
11. Orthopedic Impairments of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	20
12. Means of Mobility of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	21
13. Visual Characteristics of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	22
14. Hearing Losses of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	23
15. Means of Communication of Students by Primary Handicap Category	25
16. Other Health Impairments by Primary Handicap Categories	26
17. Specific Learning Disabilities of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	27
18. Speech/Language Disabilities by Primary Handicap Categories	29

19. Specified Individual Intelligence Tests Administered	31
20. Latest Intelligence Test Administered to Students by Year	32
21. Student Intelligence Quotients within Specified Ranges	33
22. Functioning Levels of Students in Selected Categories	34
23. Specified Ranges of Grade Placement of Students . . .	35
24. Areas of Talent of Students by Primary Handicap Cat- egories	36
25. Moderate to Marked Behaviors of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	38
26. Best Perceived Place of Residence for Handicapped Students After Completion of the K-12 Educational Program by Primary Handicap Categories	41
27. Student and Teacher Awareness and Student Interest in Post-Secondary Offerings	42
28. Teacher Perceptions and Student Interest, Training and Recommended Training in Career Goal Categories . . .	43
29. Best Probable Educational Setting by Which Handicapped Students Could be Served by Primary Handicap Catego- ries	45
30. Student's Primary Handicap and Recommended Class Size	46
31. Provisions That Apply, or Would Apply to Students in a School Setting	48
32. Learning Modalities of Students by Primary Handicap Categories	49

PREFACE

Legislation in several of the states, including Wisconsin Statute 115.81, and Federal legislation of recent passage have dealt with rights, expected societal treatment and educational opportunities that are now to be made available to all handicapped persons. At the Federal level (P.L. 94-142), in general, calls for free public education of children with exceptional educational needs ages 3 through 21, inclusive. The educational amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) include the extension and revision of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This law presently calls for 10% of each State's allotment of vocational funds as 50% of the total monies to be spent for the vocational education of handicapped persons.

Greater emphasis on post-secondary education for the handicapped was indicated in 1976 under part C Funding Priority Areas of the Vocational Education Amendments. It was with these priorities in mind that a proposal was written by Lloyd W. Tindall and selected members of the Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center staff. This proposal was entitled, *Project P.E.P., Program Evaluation and Planning*. It proposed to evaluate current vocational programs designed to meet the needs of specified handicapped persons and to identify handicapped students and their projected vocational educational needs for the period of 1977 to 1982. This proposal responded to three priority areas designated at the Federal level: 1) assessing the needs and barriers to mainstreaming appropriate handicapped students into regular vocational education programs; 2) developing criteria for the identification of such handicapped students, and; 3) evaluating existing vocational education programs that mainstream handicapped students

An investigation of this type was clearly called for since information of this type did not exist at the state level in Wisconsin and because such information could lead to intelligent planning and implementation of post-secondary vocational education programs for handicapped persons.

As a result of the acceptance of the proposal it became the

researcher's responsibility to determine the cognitive, psychomotor and affective characteristics of individual handicapped students 14 to 21 years of age, as defined by Federal Regulations, and their teachers' perceptions as to their vocational education needs within the state of Wisconsin.

To assess the educational needs of students interested in post-secondary vocational education was critical to the study. It was also critical to assess the vocational education needs of those students who in the estimation of their teachers would benefit from such education even though the students themselves had not expressed interest in further education. This investigation served to identify these handicapped students. Both types of information were solicited from teachers who were chiefly responsible for the educational program of individual handicapped students through responses entered on a mailed machine-scoreable survey instrument. It was thought that the longitudinal profile of these students would allow for equitable program planning and implementation at the district level of the post-secondary vocational education system.

Support for the undertaking of a statewide survey was not to be taken for granted. Letters supporting the survey were sought from a number of sources. A letter supporting the survey was received from Mr. Eugene Lehrmann, Director of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. Also supporting the survey was an article which appeared in the February 1977 issue of the Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators Newsletter entered by Mr. Ollie Berge, Executive Director of that association. Active were Dr. Russell Retterer and Dr. Grant Rehder who were members of the research committee of the Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Education. Their assistance in instrument design and in obtaining reliability of the instrument within the districts in which they administrate the special education program was very much appreciated. The assistance of selected Center staff members and other professional educators from various institutions in achieving face validity of the instrument was also appreciated. A list of these participants who showed their personal interest and shared their expertise may be found in Appendix A. Appreciation is also extended to Ms. Alice

DuBois, Project Assistant, who took responsibility for coordinating and mailing out the survey instruments as well as sorting them when they were returned to the Center. Her dedication and interest in doing other tasks connected with the study even though these tasks were oftentimes tedious deserves much credit. Thanks is extended to my sister, Ms. Elaine Franken, for her patience and effort in typing the major portion of the tables which appear in the text. Not to go unnoticed are the administrators at the local public school district level and the administrators of institutions and agencies who directed their teacher personnel to cooperate with the study. Lastly great appreciation is extended to the teachers of handicapped children who gave of their time and showed genuine interest in the future of the children and young adults whom they teach. It was through their cooperation and dedication that this study was made possible.

CHAPTER I

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The study which follows was designed to determine the profiles and to define the needs of handicapped children and young adults as they prepare for their roles in what will hopefully be a more humane, concerned and empathetic society. The study is an example of field oriented evaluative research designed specifically to identify handicapped youth who were being educationally served in Wisconsin's public and private schools, institutions and agencies. This portion of the report will address the topics concerned with the statement of the problem, definition of terms, sample, instrumentation, collection and treatment of data and testing of the instrument including validation and reliability of the instrument used in the survey.

Statement of the Problem

What are the cognitive, psychomotor and affective characteristics of handicapped students 14 to 21 years of age, as defined by the Federal Regulations, and their perceived needs in the community and in future education and training within the state of Wisconsin?

Definition of Terms

1. *Career Goals* Definitions of each of the career goal categories are included as part of the survey instrument and may be found on page 2 of the instrument (see Appendix B). Definitions were taken directly from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles made available by the Department of Labor.
2. *Handicapped Children*^a Means those children evaluated by qualified professionals as being mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, other health impaired, or children with specific learning disabilities, who by reason thereof require special education and related services. These terms are further defined as follows:
 - (a) *Deaf* means a hearing impairment, evaluated with a corrective device, which is so severe that the child's hearing is non-functional for purposes of educational performance.
 - (b) *Hard of hearing* means a hearing impairment, evaluated with a corrective device, which adversely affects a child's educational

^aSource: Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Register, Vol. 41, NO. 175 -- Wednesday, September 8, 1976.

performance but which is not included under the definition of "deaf" in this section.

- (c) *Mentally retarded* means impaired mental development which adversely affects a child's educational performance. The term includes children who are educable mentally retarded, trainable mentally retarded, and severely mentally retarded.
- (d) *Orthopedically impaired* means a severe orthopedic impairment, evaluated with a corrective device, which adversely affects a child's educational performance. The term includes impairments caused by congenital anomaly (e.g., clubfoot, absence of some member, etc.), impairments caused by disease (e.g., poliomyelitis, bone tuberculosis, cerebral palsy, etc.), and impairments caused by accident (e.g., fractures or burns which cause contractures, cerebral palsy, etc.).
- (e) *Other health impaired* means limited strength, vitality, or alertness due to chronic or acute health problems such as a heart condition, tuberculosis, rheumatic fever, nephritis, asthma, sickle cell anemia, hemophilia, epilepsy, lead poisoning, leukemia, diabetes, or some other illness.
- (f) *Seriously emotionally disturbed* means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree: An inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors; an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers; inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances; a general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or a tendency to develop physical symptoms, pains, or fears associated with personal or school problems. The term does not include children who are socially maladjusted but not emotionally disturbed.
- (g) *Specific learning disability* means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations. The term includes such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain disfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. The term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, mental retardation, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- (h) *Speech impaired* means a speech impairment or a language impairment (such as impaired articulation, stuttering,

voice impairment, or a receptive or expressive verbal language impairment), evaluated with a corrective device, which adversely affects a child's educational performance.

- (1) *Visually handicapped* means a visual impairment evaluated with a corrective device, which adversely affects a child's educational performance, and includes both partially sighted and blind children.
- 3. *Student* means those children 14 to 21 years of age who are considered to be handicapped children, children with exceptional educational needs and those who might otherwise be referred to as the developmentally disabled.
- 4. *Teacher* means the teacher most responsible to the education of the student with exceptional educational needs.

Sample

The original intention of the study was to obtain responses to the survey questionnaire from all teachers of the handicapped who ranged in age from 14 to 21 years, inclusive. It was thought that planning and implementation of post-secondary educational programs for these individuals could be more easily achieved if this plan had been fulfilled. Students could have been identified as individuals by their schools and parent permission could have been obtained by post-secondary school counselors to interview prospective students. However, the study was not wholly received and commitment was lacking in a major portion of the public school districts, all of which were invited to participate in the study. Partial cooperation was received from some of these districts and on the state level this cooperation amounted to 34.82%. Partial cooperation required that the chief school administrator send to the researcher a list of total numbers of handicapped students ages 14 to 21 years of age, inclusive, the name of the school administrator and the address of the school to which the instruments should be sent.

Due to difficulties in obtaining this partial cooperation, it was decided that participating schools (public and private), institutions and agencies should have the option of participating by submitting a representative 20% sample of their handicapped student population by

submitting survey instrument responses representing their entire school population from the desired age group.

Those desiring to sample were required to compile an alphabetical listing of their students who would be possible candidates for the survey. A system of randomization was then set up to choose a 20% sample from within schools desiring to participate.

Those participants who chose to submit total population responses were encouraged to do so. For this report a 20% sample of these populations was randomly selected by means of an appropriate computer program. This sample was entered in a program at the Madison Area Computer Center along with the responses of the participants who originally chose to enter a 20% random sample. In addition to certain agencies, institutions and schools from the private sector, 128 of 382 or 33.51% of the local public school districts chose to respond to the survey. For a listing of these cooperating districts, see Appendix B.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument was designed to retrieve data relative to the cognitive, psychomotor and affective characteristics of the specified student group and this group's needs in the community and in future educational pursuits directed toward career goal development.

It was decided that the instrument would be designed in such a way that it would be machine scoreable. Arrangements were made with Wisconsin State Testing located on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus to assist in format design. (See end of Appendix section for copy of the instrument.)

Collection and Treatment of the Data

Since information concerning the number and building locations of the specified age group of students was not available at the time needed, a pre-survey was implemented to obtain this information. Packets of instruments were then mailed to school principals, directors of special education or other specified professional personnel who were asked to coordinate survey efforts at the local level and to have teachers

respond to the survey instruments. Schools, institutions and agencies were allowed not to respond, to respond by surveying the specified 20% random sample of students or to survey their entire school or district population. Upon return of the instruments, header sheets were prepared for the scanning process. Header sheets were coded in the item "1" column as "A" (sample) or "Z" (total school population). A header sheet was prepared for each local school, private school, institution or agency. In addition to sample information, header sheets were also coded according to the VTAE, CESA, county, local school district and building number the instruments represented. Once instruments were in ordered stacks, they were scanned. As they were scanned, data they contained were recorded on a magnetic computer tape for analysis. This tape was then given to a computer programmer who sorted the data received into sixteen categories representing the VTAE districts. A 20% random sample from schools entering total school populations was sorted out and joined with those schools that had submitted a 20% random sample. It was this total 20% random sample that was used to generate data on each item and for the cross-tabulations that were requested by the researcher. This was the data used to generate the state profile of *Handicapped students*. *Data were recorded in number and percentage proportions for tabular presentation and discussion.*

Testing of the Instrument

The instrument was tested for both validity and reliability. These processes required the assistance of over one hundred professional persons.

Validation

Survey items were written by the researcher so that they adhered to the identifying characteristics of handicapped children as defined by Federal Regulations and in a few cases State Department of Public Instruction (DPI) definitions. Other items of interest to the study were added. Suggestions were made by two members of the Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Education (WCASE).

Instrument items were designed to provide the least effort for teachers who would be responding to them, to be clear in meaning and to be realistic, in that, information about students was known or could be secured. Average time for completion of the instrument during reliability testing ranged from 10 to 20 minutes.

The initial instrument was validated by twenty-five professional educators representing the University of Wisconsin System, the DPI, the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education (VTAE), VTAE districts and local public school districts (see Appendix A). Their suggestions proved invaluable. The instrument was rewritten a number of times and was finally given over to the format designer from Wisconsin State Testing. Instruments were printed and serially numbered for the researcher's convenience and recording procedures.

Reliability

Instrument reliability was attained through the cooperation of the two members of the WCASE research committee who had assisted with the instrument validation and design.

These same administrators collected and forwarded to the researcher over one hundred matched pairs of instruments completed by teachers in their separate special education programs. Time between the first and second completion of the instrument was designated to be a period of not less than three weeks. Composite average reliability for all questions was: $r = 0.923534$. Composite average adjusted reliability, that took into consideration multiple responses and no responses where called for, was: $r = 0.954637$. Appendix C contains the computer reading for the composite average reliability and adjusted reliability for each item in the survey instrument.

Limitations of Data Interpretation

Survey instrument response resulted in a 20% random sample representing a total of 1,186 students from Wisconsin. Table 1 shows the

comparison of state student population to study sample. Examination of this table reveals that the study sample represents 6.52% of Wisconsin's population of handicapped students in the designated age group. It also shows that proportions compared to state figures of designated handicap categories varied from 0.37% to 12.22% of total numbers within categories. In all categories other than mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed and learning disabled, the students percentage representation

Table 1: Proportion of State Population and Study Sample of Students by Handicap Categories

		State ^a	Study ^b	% of Population in Study
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	N	384	18	
	%	2.28	1.58	4.69
Mentally Retarded	N	9,410	602	6.40
	%	53.00	53.22	
Orthopedically Handicapped and Other Health Impaired	N	677	26	3.84
	%	4.01	2.29	
Emotionally Disturbed	N	1,808	221	12.22
	%	10.72	19.54	
Learning Disabled	N	2,991	251	8.39
	%	17.74	22.19	
Speech/Language	N	1,891	7	0.37
	%	11.21	0.62	
Visually Handicapped	N	179	6	3.35
	%	1.06	0.53	
Total	N	17,340	1,131	
	%	100.00	100.00	6.52

Note: ^a State figures are from 1975 and therefore represent approximate handicapped population in Wisconsin. Current figures are not available; however, ratios shown remain constant.

^b Total sample of study was 1,186; however, only 1,131 responded to the survey item related to primary handicap.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Division of Handicapped Children, School District Plan, Part A, Annual Report on Special Education Programs for the Handicapped, 1975-76.

ranged from only 0.37% to 4.69% of the total school state estimated population of handicapped ranging in age from 14 to 21. Since total numbers of students within categories in this study are small and range from 5 to 19 in total number in other than mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed and learning disabled, generalities and conclusions cannot be made relative to these lesser represented groups.

It should be noted that over 400 students could have been entered as respondents, which would have brought the sample size to approximately 1,600, if Milwaukee could have participated in the study. However, at the time of data collection, Milwaukee teachers were on strike. As a result, Milwaukee was not represented although they had confirmed their desire to cooperate with the survey. As a result, questions pertaining to racial and ethnic background and bilingualism, and ratios of the lesser represented handicap categories were found to be far less in number than expected. Milwaukee has the largest Black and Spanish speaking populations in Wisconsin and is able to provide classes for handicapped groups having lesser numbers. (To assist the reader a map of Wisconsin, showing its counties and Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Districts has been included as Appendix D)

Significance of the Study

The study that follows is significant for a number of reasons. It has generated information about handicapped adolescents that has not been previously gathered at the state level. The data included information concerning profiles of handicapped adolescents in addition to their projected educational needs pursuant to their identified career goals. This study has made it possible to plan and implement programs designed to meet the special needs of these youth. It should further be instrumental in the unification of articulation efforts of the DPI and the WBVTAE as they serve the handicapped.

CHAPTER II

REPORT OF THE DATA

This portion of the report addresses the data of the survey research project. It identifies categories of handicapped students and in most cases defines the way in which these categories of students relate to profile characteristics in the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains. It also addresses educational needs of students and needs these students will have in the communities in which they will one day live.

Demographic Data

This section reports the data relating to the incidence of handicapped students in the population and their descriptive characteristics within handicapped categories.

Population Characteristics

The public school system in Wisconsin serves approximately 200,000 students in its K-12 system who range in age from 14-20. According to latest available figures, approximately 17,500 (8.75%) of these students are designated handicapped according to the Federal Regulatory Code which defines handicap categories for children to be served in special education programs.

The 20% random sample surveyed in this study produced a total student number representation of 1,186. Of these, 689 (67.95%) were male and 325 (32.05%) were female. Males tended to predominate in the categories of mentally retarded (MR), (62%), emotionally disturbed/behavior disabled (ED/BD), (74%), learning disabled (LD), (86%).

Females were found in the majority of the other handicap categories with the exception of the category of other health impaired (OHI). However, representation in these categories was small; and, therefore,

conclusions regarding sex ratios within these categories cannot be made (see Table 2).

In comparison to the 1970 Wisconsin Census figures relating to racial/ethnic distribution, the study figures represent approximately matching ratios except in the American Indian category. The study shows this group to be a little over three times the percentage found in the general state population. The results of the survey presented in Table 3 shows the majority of handicapped students served educationally to be White or Caucasian (94%).

Of the students who were bilingual, two-thirds spoke a Spanish dialect (see Table 4).

Table 5 shows the number of children served in all handicap categories to be 66% for ages 14-16, 27% for ages 17-18, and 7% for ages 19-20. Highest retention of students in the age range of 19-20 occurs in the categories of educable mental retardation (EMR), 45% and trainable mental retardation (TMR), 31%. All other categories show a retention of from approximately 2 to 9%. Percentage indications in the cross-tabulations of the 14-18 age ranges and the handicap categories suggest that student drop-outs are occurring in the categories of emotionally disturbed and/or behavior disordered (ED/BD) since they drop from 12% to 4%; in the category of learning disabled (LD) since they drop from 22% to 4%; and in speech/language impaired (S/L) since they drop from 12% to 9%.

Table 6, which shows study data pertaining to ages and primary handicap categories also shows greater retention of EMR and TMR students. The ED/BD and LD categories drop off at age 18 and show a substantial decline at age 17. Other categories contain small numbers and it would be unfair to try to speculate regarding retention and drop-out percentages. Retention across handicap categories is 42% in the 14-15 age group; 42% in the 16-17 age group; and 14% in the 18-20 age group.

Table 2 : Proportion of Students by Primary Handicap Categories and Sex

Sex		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Male	N	2	6	271	42	29	9	3	140	180	6	1	689
	C%	40.00	50.00	64.99	50.00	56.86	56.25	60.00	73.68	81.45	85.71	16.67	67.95
	R%	0.29	0.87	39.33	6.10	4.21	1.31	0.44	20.32	26.12	0.87	0.15	100.00
Female	N	3	6	146	42	22	7	2	50	41	1	5	325
	C%	60.00	50.00	35.01	50.00	43.14	43.75	40.00	26.32	18.55	14.29	83.33	32.05
	R%	0.92	1.85	44.92	12.92	6.77	2.15	0.62	15.38	12.62	0.31	1.54	100.00
Total	N	5	12	417	84	51	16	5	190	221	7	6	1,014
	C%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	R%	0.49	1.18	41.12	8.28	5.03	1.58	0.49	18.74	21.79	0.69	0.59	100.00

Note. Total number of survey respondents equaled 1,186. The total count for this table is 1,014 and is due to non-response to either the question requiring a response about sex categories and/or primary handicap categories.

Table 3: Proportion of Students Versus State Population Estimates by Race or Ethnic Group

Race or Ethnic Origin		Students (N = 1,138)	Approximate 1970 State Population (N = 4,500,000)
Black, Afro-American	N	41	128,224
	%	3.60	2.87
Mexican-American, Chicano Spanish surname, Puerto Rican, Cuban or Latin American	N	9	41,402
	%	.79	0.92
American Indian	N	16	18,924
	%	1.41	0.42
Oriental or Asian American	N	2	6,000
	%	.18	0.13
White or Caucasian	N	1,065	4,248,959
	%	93.59	94.64
Other	N	5	5,067
	%	.44	0.11

Table 4: Students and Their Second Language

Second Language		Students (N = 1124)
Bilingual	N	9
	%	.80
Spanish dialect	N	6
	%	.50

Study results in Table 7 show that 1,131 of 1,186 (95%) of the students have primary handicaps as indicated by their teachers. Three categories contain substantial numbers of students and are therefore representative of their specific categories. These are the categories pertaining to mental retardation, emotionally disturbed/behavior disordered and learning disabled. Incidence within the study sample are: MR (53%), ED/BD (20%) and LD (22%). These are the groups that will be addressed specifically in the remainder of the report.

For many years educators have had comments regarding the labeling of children and the placing of students in handicap categories. As indicated in Table 8, students who have been labeled and placed in a primary

Table 5: Proportion of Public School EEN Students by Primary Handicap Categories and Age Ranges

Primary Handicap		Age Ranges			Total
		14-16	17-18	19-20	
Deaf/Hard of Hearing	N	230	123	31	384
	C%	2.08	2.71	2.49	2.28
	R%	59.90	32.03	8.07	100.00
Educable Mentally Retarded	N	4,362	2,373	557	7,292
	C%	39.38	52.27	44.70	43.24
	R%	59.82	32.54	7.64	100.00
Trainable Mentally Retarded	N	743	519	380	1,642
	C%	6.71	11.43	30.50	9.74
	R%	45.25	31.61	23.14	100.00
Orthopedically Handicapped	N	300	153	23	476
	C%	2.71	3.37	1.85	2.82
	R%	63.03	32.14	4.83	100.00
Physically/Multiply Handicapped	N	122	54	25	201
	C%	1.10	1.19	2.01	1.19
	R%	60.70	26.87	12.44	100.00
Emotionally Disturbed and/or Behavior Disordered	N	1,381	379	48	1,808
	C%	12.47	8.35	3.85	10.72
	R%	76.38	20.96	2.65	100.00
Learning disabled	N	2,452	484	55	2,991
	C%	22.13	10.66	4.41	17.74
	R%	81.98	16.18	1.84	100.00
Speech/Language Impaired	N	1,375	410	106	1,891
	C%	12.41	9.03	8.51	11.21
	R%	72.71	21.28	5.61	100.00
Visually Handicapped	N	113	45	21	179
	C%	1.02	0.99	1.69	1.06
	R%	63.13	25.14	11.73	100.00
Total	N	11,078	4,540	1,246	16,864
	C%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	R%	65.59	26.92	7.39	100.00

Source: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Division of Handicapped Children, School District Plan, Part A, Annual Report on Special Education Programs for the Handicapped, 1975-76.

Table 6: Ages of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Ages in years		HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	TOTAL
14	N		22	4				17	18	2	53
	CI		12.94	12.50				22.67	14.00	33.33	17.03
	RZ		34.92	6.35				16.98	28.57	3.17	100.00
15	N		34	6	1			21	28	1	91
	CI		20.00	18.75	50.00			28.00	37.33	16.67	24.59
	RZ		37.36	6.59	1.10			27.08	30.77	1.10	100.00
16	N	1	40	7	1	1	1	21	14	2	88
	CI	50.00	23.53	21.88	50.00	20.00	33.33	28.00	18.67	33.33	23.78
	RZ	1.14	45.45	7.95	1.14	1.14	1.14	23.86	15.91	2.27	100.00
17	N		39	5			2	13	9	1	69
	CI		22.94	15.63			2.90	17.33	12.00	16.67	18.65
	RZ		56.52	7.25			66.67	18.8	13.04	1.45	100.00
18	N	1	23	4		2		1	6		37
	CI	50.00	13.53	12.50		40.00		1.33	8.00		10.00
	RZ	2.70	62.16	10.81		5.41		2.70	16.22		100.00
19	N		10	3		1		1			15
	CI		5.88	9.38		20.00		1.33			4.05
	RZ		66.67	20.00		6.67		6.67			100.00
20	N		2	3		1		1			7
	CI		1.18	9.38		20.00		1.33			1.89
	RZ		28.57	42.86		14.29		14.29			100.00
Total	N	2	170	32	2	5	3	75	75	6	470
	CI	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.54	45.95	8.65	0.54	1.35	0.81	20.27	20.27	1.62	100.00

Note. The total N for this table represents only those teachers who chose to respond to the question concerning age of their students.

handicap category tended to have one or more secondary handicaps. In descending order the MR group showed secondary handicaps in the following percentages: 33% were speech/language impaired; 23% were emotionally disturbed; 18% were orthopedically handicapped; 8% were learning disabled; 5% were visually handicapped; 4% were hard of hearing and 2% were deaf. Those who are primarily emotionally disturbed show a secondary handicap especially in the learning disabled category (52%) and the mentally retarded category (33%). Those who are primarily categorized as learning disabled show that in 43% of the cases they are secondarily considered to be emotionally disturbed.

Program Placement of Students

It was found that, in most cases, students with primary handicaps were placed in classes provided to deal specifically with their primary disability. In some cases such as in the EMR, TMR and SMR categories

Table 7: Proportion of Students and Their Primary Handicaps

15

Primary Handicap		Count (N=1131)
Deaf (D)	N	5
	%	.44
Hard of Hearing (HH)	N	13
	%	1.14
Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR)	N	460
	%	40.67
Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR)	N	87
	%	7.69
Subtrainable Mentally Retarded (SMR)	N	55
	%	4.86
Orthopedically Handicapped (OH)	N	19
	%	1.68
Other Health Impaired (OHI)	N	7
	%	.61
Emotionally Disturbed/Behavior Disordered (ED/BD)	N	221
	%	19.54
Learning Disabled (LD)	N	251
	%	22.19
Speech Impaired (SI)	N	7
	%	.62
Visually Handicapped (VH)	N	6
	%	.53

students were challenged by being placed in classes which were above their diagnosed ability or in regular classes. Approximately 2% of EMR, 2% of ED/BD and 4% of LD students were placed in regular school programs with supportive services. Less than 1% of the EMR and LD students were placed in regular classes, while approximately 2% of the ED students were placed in regular programs (see Table 9).

Orthopedic Impairments of Students

Of those students who were orthopedically handicapped, approximately 71% were impaired since birth, 10% were impaired through some type of accident and 20% were impaired through a disease process (see Table 10).

Table 11 shows that most orthopedic impairment from among the three groups under consideration, namely the mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed and learning disabled occurred in the MR group categories. From 12% to 18% of the EMR-TMR group were found to have right and/or left finger impairments that would interfere with task completion requiring

Table 8: Secondary Handicaps of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Secondary Handicap		Primary Handicap											Total
		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	
Deaf	N			4	1								5
	CZ			3.33	12.50								1.47
	RZ			80.00	20.00								100.00
Hard of Hearing	N			7	2		1		1	2	1		14
	CZ			5.83	25.00		4.76		1.92	5.00	20.00		4.12
	RZ			50.00	14.29		7.14		7.14	14.29	7.14		100.00
Educable Mentally Retarded	N	1					3	1	14	3	1		23
	CZ	25.00					14.29	20.00	26.92	7.50	20.00		6.76
	RZ	4.35					13.04	4.35	60.87	13.04	4.35		100.00
Trainable Mentally Retarded	N						4		3				7
	CZ						19.05		5.77				2.06
	RZ						57.14		42.86				100.00
Severely mentally Retarded (Sub-trainable)	N						1	1					2
	CZ						4.76	20.00					0.59
	RZ						50.00	50.00					100.00
Orthopedically Handicapped	N			20	1	16		1	3	1		1	43
	CZ			16.67	12.50	19.51		20.00	5.77	2.50		33.33	12.65
	RZ			46.51	2.33	37.21		2.33	6.98	2.33		2.33	100.00
Other Health Impaired	N			9		4	2		1	3	2		21
	CZ			7.50		4.88	9.52		1.92	7.50	40.00		6.18
	RZ			42.86		19.05	9.52		4.76	14.29	9.52		100.00
Emotionally Disturbed and/or Behavior Disordered	N	1		30	1	17				17		2	68
	CZ	25.00		25.00	12.50	20.73				42.50		66.67	20.00
	RZ	1.47		44.12	1.47	25.00				25.00		2.94	100.00
Learning Disabled	N			12	2	3	1	1	27				46
	CZ			10.00	25.00	3.66	4.76	20.00	51.92				13.53
	RZ			26.09	4.35	6.52	2.17	2.17	58.70				100.00
Speech/Language Impaired	N	2		28	1	41	7	1	2	12	1		95
	CZ	50.00		23.33	12.50	50.00	33.33	20.00	3.85	2.50	20.00		27.94
	RZ	2.11		29.47	11.58	43.16	7.37	11.58	2.11	12.63	11.58		100.00
Visually handicapped	N			10		1	2		1	2			16
	CZ			8.33		1.22	9.52		1.92	5.00			4.71
	RZ			62.50		6.25	12.50		6.25	12.50			100.00
Total	N	4		120	8	82	21	5	52	40	5	3	340
	CZ	100.00		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	1.18		35.29	2.35	24.12	6.18	1.47	15.29	11.76	1.47	0.88	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 9: Type of Program in Which Students Were Enrolled by Primary Handicap Categories

Type or Program		D	HH	EMR	THR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Deaf/Hard of Hearing	N	3											10
	CZ	75.00	53.85										0.97
	RZ	30.00	70.00										100.00
Educable Mentally Retarded	N		1	418	6			1	7	2	1		437
	CZ		7.69	96.31	7.14		6.67	14.29	3.41	0.96	16.67		2.26
	RZ		0.23	95.65	1.37		3.23	0.23	1.60	0.46	1.60		100.00
Trainable Mentally Retarded	N			1	77	8			1				87
	CZ			0.23	91.67	14.81			0.49				8.41
	RZ			1.15	89.51	9.20			1.15				100.00
Subtrainable	N					43		1					44
	CZ					79.63		14.29					4.26
	RZ					17.73		2.27					100.00
Physically Handicapped/ Other Health Impaired	N												1
	CZ						5.67						0.10
	RZ						100.00						100.00
Multiple Handicapped	N					2	5					1	8
	CZ					3.70	25.00					25.00	0.77
	RZ					25.00	62.50					12.50	100.00
Emotionally Disturbed/ Behavior Disordered	N								179				179
	CZ								57.32				7.31
	RZ								100.00				100.00
Learning Disability	N			1				1	6	191			199
	CZ			0.23				14.29	2.93	91.83			9.25
	RZ			0.50				0.50	3.02	95.98			100.00
Speech/Language Impaired	N		1	1						5	3		10
	CZ		7.69	0.23						2.40	50.00		0.97
	RZ		10.00	10.00						50.00	30.00		100.00
Blind/Visually Impaired	N												
	CZ												
	RZ												
Regular Programming With Supportive Services	N	1	3	9		1			4	8	1	2	34
	CZ	25.00	23.08	2.07		1.85	25.00		1.95	3.85	16.67	50.00	3.29
	RZ	2.94	8.42	26.47		2.94	14.7		11.76	23.53	2.94	5.88	100.00
Regular Programming	N		1	2				4	5	1	1	1	17
	CZ		7.69	0.46			13.33	57.14	2.44	0.48	16.67	25.00	1.64
	RZ		5.88	11.76			11.76	23.53	29.41	5.88	5.88	5.88	100.00
None of the Above	N			2	1				3	1			8
	CZ			0.46	1.19		6.67		1.46	0.48			0.77
	RZ			25.00	11.50		12.50		37.50	12.50			100.00
Total	N	6	13	434	84	54	15	7	205	208	6	4	1,034
	CZ	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.39	1.26	41.97	8.12	5.22	1.45	0.68	19.83	20.12	0.58	0.39	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 10: Etymology of Orthopedic Disabilities of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

18

Etymology		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Orthopedically impaired:													
since birth	N		1	20	9	14	13	5	3	1		1	67
	%		100.00	74.07	90.00	77.78	68.42	50.00	42.86	50.00		100.00	70.53
due to accident	N			2	1	1	1	1	3				9
	%			7.41	10.00	5.56	5.26	10.00	42.86				9.47
through disease process	N			5		3	5	4	1	1			19
	%			18.52		16.67	26.32	40.00	14.29	50.00			20.00
Total	N		1	27	10	18	19	10	7	2		1	95
	%		1.05	28.42	10.53	18.95	20.00	10.53	7.37	2.11		1.05	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

30

fine motor coordination. From 7% to 18% of this group were found to have right and/or left arm impairments that would interfere with task completion requiring gross motor coordination of the upper appendage(s). From 6% to 17% were found to have left foot/leg impairment; while, 12% to 18% of the EMR-TMR group were found to have right leg/foot impairments.

Table 12 shows that of the (18%) of the EMR-TMR, who were also orthopedically handicapped, 14% used crutches, 29% were required to use a wheelchair and 57% used some type of orthopedic appliance for ambulation. Recalling from Table 8, 23 of 131, (18%) of the students of both EMR-TMR groups had some type of orthopedic handicap; of these, 58% required some device or appliance for mobility.

Visual Impairments of Students

Of all the students, 15% were shown to have visual impairments. Table 13 shows that 5% of the visually handicapped MR students were found to be blind, and that 60% of them were blind since birth. None of the MR students were able to read Braille. Of the visually impaired students, 64% had impaired visual activity, 13% had peripheral field impairment and 17% had central vision impairments. Of the learning disabled with visual impairments, 83% had impaired visual activity, as did 69% of the emotionally disturbed students with visual impairments.

Auditory Impairments of Students

The largest number of students who showed hearing losses other than the deaf and hard of hearing themselves were the EMR-TMR group. While 19% of this group were found to be deaf, most showed hearing losses of from 20 to 40 decibels. This held true for those students who were primarily classified as ED/BD and LD (see Table 14).

Table 15 shows that only small percentages of handicapped students who had secondary hearing impairments other than those that were categorized as either deaf (D) or hard of hearing (HH) were signers or

Table 11: Orthopedic Impairments of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Orthopedic Impairments		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Impaired right:													
fingers	N			7	3	9	9			1			29
	C%			11.86	17.65	9.89	9.38			25.00			9.83
	R%			24.14	10.34	31.03	31.03			3.45			100.00
arm	N			4	2	9	10	1					26
	C%			6.78	11.76	9.89	10.42	4.55					8.81
	R%			15.38	7.69	34.62	38.46	3.85					100.00
foot	N			8	2	13	13	4			1		41
	C%			13.56	11.76	14.29	13.54	18.18			100.00		13.90
	R%			19.51	4.88	31.71	31.71	9.76			2.44		100.00
leg	N			10	3	14	13	5	1				46
	C%			16.95	17.65	15.38	13.54	22.73	50.00				15.59
	R%			21.74	6.52	30.43	28.26	10.87	2.17				100.00
Impaired left:													
fingers	N			9	3	9	10	1		1		1	34
	C%			15.25	17.65	9.89	10.42	4.55		25.00		33.33	11.53
	R%			26.47	8.82	26.47	29.41	2.94		2.94		2.94	100.00
arm	N			5	2	9	12	2				1	31
	C%			8.47	11.76	9.89	12.50	9.09				33.33	10.51
	R%			16.13	6.45	29.03	38.71	6.45				3.23	100.00
foot	N			6	1	14	14	4		1			40
	C%			10.17	5.88	15.38	14.58	18.18		25.00			13.56
	R%			15.00	2.50	35.00	35.00	10.00		2.50			100.00
leg	N			10	1	14	15	5	1	1		1	48
	C%			16.95	5.88	15.38	15.63	22.73	50.00	25.00		33.33	16.27
	R%			20.83	2.08	29.17	31.25	10.42	2.08	2.08		2.08	100.00
Total	N			59	17	91	96	22	2	4	1	3	295
	C%			100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	R%			20.00	5.76	30.85	32.54	7.46	0.68	1.36	0.34	1.02	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 12: Means of Mobility of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Means of Mobility		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Use:													
Crutches	N			2			4	1					8
	%			22.22			14.29	14.29					12.31
Wheelchair	N			3	1	9	12	3					28
	%			33.33	20.00	60.00	42.86	42.86					43.08
Other orthopedic appliance	N			4	4	6	12	3					29
	%			44.44	80.00	40.00	42.86	42.86					44.62
Total	N			9	5	15	28	7					65
	%			13.85	7.69	23.08	43.08	10.77					100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 13: Visual Characteristics of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Visual Characteristics		D/HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Blind	N		4	1							2	7
	%		5.13	4.17							11.11	4.05
Blind since birth	N		2	1								3
	%		2.56	4.17								1.73
Braille reader	N										1	1
	%										5.56	0.58
Impaired visual activity with corrective device	N		55	12	2	4		11	20	1	5	110
	%		70.51	50.00	66.67	50.00		68.75	83.33		27.78	63.58
Peripheral field impairment	N		8	5		1	1	1	1		5	22
	%		10.26	20.83		12.50	100.00	6.25	4.17		27.78	12.72
Central vision impairment	N		9	5	1	3		4	3		5	30
	%		11.54	20.83	33.33	37.50		25.00	12.50		27.78	17.34
Total	N		78	24	3	8	1	16	24	1	18	173
	%		45.09	13.87	1.73	4.62	0.58	9.25	13.87	1.73	10.40	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 14: Hearing Losses of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Hearing Losses		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Deaf	N	4	9	3	2		1		1		1		21
	%	44.44	45.00	15.00	28.57		100.00		16.67		33.33		29.17
Decibel loss in better ear:													
20 - 30 db	N		1	9	1				4	4	1		20
	%		5.00	45.00	14.29				66.67	66.67	33.33		27.18
30 - 40 db	N		1	2	3				1	2			9
	%		5.00	10.00	42.86				16.67	33.33			12.50
40 - 60 db	N		2	2	1								5
	%		10.00	10.00	14.29								6.94
60 - 75 db	N	1	4	1							1		7
	%	11.11	20.00	5.00							33.33		9.12
75 db plus	N	4	3	3									10
	%	44.44	15.00	15.00									13.89
Total	N	9	20	20	7		1		6	6	3		72
	%	12.50	27.18	27.18	9.12		1.39		8.33	8.33	4.17		100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

lip readers. Less than half of the D/HH groups were verbal communicators. Most other handicapped students who were secondarily D/HH were found to be verbal communicators.

Other Health Impairments of Students

Approximately 16% of the students suffered from other health impairments. Other major health impairments among the EMR group were heart problems (12%), epilepsy (33%), and neurological impairment (39%). The TMR showed 9% with heart conditions, 29% with epilepsy and 54% with neurological impairments. The latter proved to be the chief other health impairment among the SMR group. Emotionally disturbed children with other health impairments were found to suffer chiefly from neurological impairments (35%), asthma (25%) and epilepsy (15%). Among the learning disabled students, 62% were found to suffer from a neurological impairment (see Table 16).

Specific Learning Disabilities of Students

On the basis of 1,186 instruments being responded to, over half of the students had specific learning problems in thinking (59%), calculating (68%), writing (i.e., written expression) (75%), reading (75%) and spelling (84%). Reading, spelling, writing and calculating were the four main areas of difficulty for the mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed and learning disabled groups. The learning disability of listening may have been interpreted by the teachers of the deaf/hard of hearing as being a difficulty in hearing. The EMR-TMR, LD students had the most over-all learning problems followed by the emotionally disturbed students (see Table 17).

Speech/Language Disabilities

The chief speech/language disabilities of the MR, ED/BD and LD students were found to be those most prevalent across the primary disability categories. Across all primary disabilities 26% of the students had poor sentence structure, 22% expressive language problems, 21%

Table 15: Means of Communication of Students by Primary Handicap Category

Means of Communication		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Signer	N	3	1	1	3				2				10
	%	30.00	4.17	0.47	6.25				2.74				2.07
Lip reader	N	4	12	1						1	1		19
	%	40.00	50.00	0.47						1.18	50.00		3.94
Verbal communicator	N	3	11	213	45	11	10	2	71	84	1	2	453
	%	30.00	45.83	59.07	93.75	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.26	98.82	50.00	100.00	93.98
Total	N	10	24	215	48	11	10	2	73	85	2	2	482
	%	2.07	4.98	44.61	9.96	2.28	2.07	0.41	15.15	17.63	0.41	0.41	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 16: Other Health Impairments by Primary Handicap Categories

26

Other Health Impairments		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Heart condition	N			7	3			1		3			14
	CZ			12.28	8.57			16.67		11.54			7.37
	RZ			50.00	21.43			7.14		21.43			100.00
Kidney problem	N			2	1	1	2		2				8
	CZ			3.51	2.86	3.33	16.67		10.00				4.21
	RZ			25.00	12.50	12.50	25.00		25.00				100.00
Asthma	N			4	1		2		5	2			14
	CZ			7.02	2.86		16.67		25.00	7.69			7.37
	RZ			28.67	7.14		14.29		35.71	14.29			100.00
Sickle cell anemia	N					1							1
	CZ					3.33							0.53
	RZ					100.00							100.00
Hemophilia	N												
	CZ												
	RZ												
Epilepsy	N			19	10	8		1	3				41
	CZ			33.33	28.57	26.67		16.67	15.00				21.58
	RZ			46.34	24.39	19.61		40.66	7.32				100.00
Leukemia	N												
	CZ												
	RZ												
Diabetes	N			1					2	2			5
	CZ			1.75					10.00	7.69			2.63
	RZ			20.00					40.00	40.00			100.00
Liver problems	N												
	CZ												
	RZ												
Chronic anemia	N					1							1
	CZ					3.33							0.53
	RZ					100.00							100.00
High blood pressure	N			2	1				1	3	1		8
	CZ			3.51	2.86				5.00	11.54	100.00		4.21
	RZ			25.00	12.50				12.50	37.50	12.50		100.00
Neurological impairment	N	1		22	19	19	8	4	7	16		2	98
	CZ	100.00		38.60	54.29	63.33	66.67	66.67	35.00	61.54		100.00	51.58
	RZ	1.02		22.45	19.39	19.39	8.16	4.08	7.14	16.33		2.04	100.00
Total	N	1		57	35	30	12	6	20	26	1	2	190
	CZ	100.00		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.53		30.00	18.42	15.79	6.32	3.16	10.53	13.68	0.53	1.05	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 17: Specific Learning Disabilities of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Specific Learning Disabilities		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Listening	N	5	12	198	60	52	5	1	61	105	4	1	504
	CZ	15.15	20.34	8.11	9.69	12.24	6.67	4.17	10.15	9.16	12.50	5.56	9.21
	RZ	0.99	2.38	39.29	11.90	10.32	0.99	0.20	12.10	20.83	0.79	0.20	100.00
Thinking	N	3	3	354	84	55	9	3	75	106	3	1	696
	CZ	9.09	5.08	14.50	13.57	12.94	12.00	12.50	12.48	9.25	9.38	5.56	12.72
	RZ	0.43	0.43	50.86	12.07	7.90	1.29	0.43	10.49	15.23	0.43	0.14	100.00
Speaking	N	4	10	162	70	52	11	1	37	40	7	2	396
	CZ	12.12	16.95	6.64	11.31	12.24	14.67	4.17	6.16	3.49	21.88	11.11	7.24
	RZ	1.01	2.53	40.91	17.68	13.13	2.78	0.25	9.34	10.10	1.77	0.51	100.00
Reading	N	5	10	402	85	55	9	4	98	219	5	2	894
	CZ	15.15	16.95	16.47	13.73	12.94	12.00	16.67	16.31	19.11	15.63	11.11	16.33
	RZ	0.56	0.11	44.97	9.51	6.15	1.01	0.45	10.96	24.50	0.56	0.22	100.00
Writing (i.e., written expression)	N	5	8	394	86	55	11	4	107	213	4	3	890
	CZ	15.15	13.56	16.14	13.89	12.94	14.67	16.67	17.80	18.59	12.50	16.67	16.26
	RZ	0.56	0.90	44.61	9.66	6.18	1.24	0.45	12.02	23.93	0.45	0.34	100.00
Spelling	N	5	9	397	86	55	12	4	101	223	5	2	999
	CZ	15.15	15.25	16.26	13.89	12.94	16.00	16.67	16.81	19.46	15.63	11.11	16.43
	RZ	0.56	1.00	44.16	9.57	6.12	1.33	0.44	11.23	24.81	0.56	0.22	100.00
Calculating	N	5	7	386	86	55	10	4	96	153	2	2	806
	CZ	15.15	11.86	15.81	9.57	12.94	13.33	16.67	15.97	13.35	6.25	11.11	14.73
	RZ	0.62	0.87	47.89	10.67	6.82	1.24	0.50	11.91	18.98	0.25	0.25	100.00
Visual perception	N	1		148	62	46	8	3	26	87	2	5	388
	CZ	3.03		6.06	10.02	10.82	10.67	12.50	4.33	7.59	6.25	27.78	7.09
	RZ	0.26		38.14	15.98	11.86	2.06	0.77	6.70	22.42	0.52	1.29	100.00
Total	N	33	59	2,441	619	425	75	24	601	1,146	32	18	5,473
	CZ	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.60	1.08	44.60	11.31	7.77	1.37	0.07	10.98	20.94	0.58	0.33	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

receptive language disabilities. On the average adequate vocabulary was found to exist in 17% of the handicapped students. Language impairment due to cultural background was found to exist chiefly among EMR and ED/BD students. Stuttering conditions occurred most frequently among the speech/language impaired students. Impaired articulation was found to be a major problem of the deaf and hard of hearing as well as to speech/language students. Voice disordered and delayed speech were found most frequently among the D/HH, and TMR-SMR students (see Table 18).

Table 18: Speech/Language Disabilities by Primary Handicap Categories

Speech/Language Disabilities		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Poor sentence structure	N	5	10	338	60	53	9	3	111	167	4	2	762
	CX	33.33	25.00	26.87	22.90	45.69	15.25	16.67	21.81	25.57	23.53	22.22	25.78
	RZ	0.66	1.31	44.36	7.87	6.96	1.18	0.39	1.44	21.92	0.52	0.26	100.00
Receptive language	N	1	7	273	46	9	14	4	116	152	2	3	627
	CX	6.67	17.50	21.70	17.56	7.76	23.73	22.22	22.79	23.26	11.76	33.33	21.21
	RZ	0.16	1.12	43.54	7.34	1.44	2.23	0.64	18.50	24.24	0.32	0.48	100.00
Expressive language	N		8	281	43	7	11	5	115	171	3	1	645
	CX		20.00	22.34	16.41	6.03	18.64	27.78	22.59	26.19	17.65	11.11	21.82
	RZ		1.24	43.57	6.67	1.09	1.71	0.78	17.83	26.51	0.47	0.16	100.00
Adequate vocabulary for age	N		4	200	11	2	9	4	121	136	2	2	491
	CX		10.00	15.90	4.20	1.72	15.25	22.22	23.77	20.83	11.76	22.22	16.61
	RZ		0.81	40.73	2.24	0.41	1.83	0.81	24.64	27.70	0.41	0.41	100.00
Language impairment (cultural background)	N			69	8	1	2		25	14			119
	CX			5.48	3.05	0.86	3.39		4.91	2.14			4.03
	RZ			57.98	6.72	0.84	1.68		21.01	11.76			100.00
Stuttering condition	N			16	10				4	4	3		37
	CX			1.27	3.82				0.79	0.61	17.65		1.25
	RZ			43.24	27.03				10.81	10.81	8.11		100.00
Impaired articulation	N	3	8	54	37	13	9		11	5	3		143
	CX	20.00	20.00	4.29	14.12	11.21	15.25		2.16	0.77	17.65		4.84
	RZ	2.10	5.59	37.76	25.87	9.09	6.29		7.69	3.50	2.10		100.00
Voice disorder	N	3		15	7	5	4	1	1	2			38
	CX	20.00		1.19	2.67	4.31	6.78	5.56	0.20	0.31			1.29
	RZ	7.89		39.47	18.42	13.16	10.53	2.63	2.63	5.26			100.00
Delayed speech	N	3	3	12	40	26	1	1	5	2		1	94
	CX	20.00	7.50	0.95	15.27	22.41	1.69	5.56	0.98	0.31		11.11	3.18
	RZ	3.19	3.19	12.77	42.55	27.66	1.06	1.06	5.32	2.13		1.06	100.00
Total	N	15	40	1,258	262	116	59	18	509	653	17	9	2,956
	CX	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.51	1.35	42.56	8.86	3.92	2.00	0.61	17.22	22.09	0.58	0.30	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Cognitive Data

Data that indicates the cognitive functioning capabilities of any student can only be suggested by examination of such things as tests that measure the individual intelligence quotients of students, their achievement levels in specified academic and psychomotor areas, their areas of talent, and their grade placement and whether they are above or below where they would ordinarily be placed if they were at, at least, normal levels in areas of course achievement. This portion of the report addresses these areas as indicators of cognitive functioning.

Types of Intelligence Tests Administered to Students

Teachers were asked to respond to the type of individual intelligence tests that were administered to their students. These are listed in Table 19. Although the Arthur Adaptation of the Leiter International Performance Scale (a non-verbal Binet scale used to test younger children of 2-12 years mental age) and the Hiskey-Nebraska Test of Learning Aptitude (used to test the deaf and hard of hearing) were among the choices, they were not selected as having been used to test the intelligence of any of the students involved in the survey.

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R) were the chief individual intelligence scales that were used. Their use occurred in 71% of the students tested while the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale was administered in 6% of the students tested. Other tests which could well have been group type intelligence tests were given to 5% of the students tested. Teachers indicated that 6% of the students they taught were placed having never been given any type of intelligence test.

Table 19: Specified Individual Intelligence Tests Administered to Students

Individual Intelligence Tests	Count (N = 1067)	
Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale	N	64
	%	6.00
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)	N	403
	%	37.77
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R)	N	358
	%	33.55
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS)	N	127
	%	11.90
Other	N	55
	%	5.15
None given	N	60
	%	5.62

Year Latest Intelligence Test Was Administered

Wisconsin Statute 115.80 (5) states:

Each child who has attained the age of 3 years and who is receiving special education under s. 115.85 (2) or in a state or county residential facility supervised under s. 115.77 (3) (d) shall be reexamined by a multidisciplinary team at least once every 3 years.

Wisconsin Statute 115.80 (3) specifies that the multidisciplinary team be composed of 2 or more persons who are skilled in programming for children with exceptional educational needs. Educational psychologists who are the persons who ordinarily administer individual intelligence tests are not specified members of this team. Evaluation and reevaluation procedures under the law make no mention of specified tests to be used in either evaluation process. However, it is interesting to note that in 75% of the students who were evaluated, an intelligence scale was administered to them within the last three year period. Of the sample of 1186, 1060 responded leaving (11%) of the teachers who did not respond to this question. This suggests that intelligence tests were not administered as part of an evaluation for placement. Of the students who were designated as having been administered IQ tests, 25% were administered from more than 3 years previous to 10 years previous to 1977 (see Table 20).

Table 20: Latest Intelligence Test Administered to Students by Year

Year Administered		Count (N = 1060)
1967	N	80
	%	7.55
1968	N	2
	%	.19
1969	N	1
	%	.01
1970	N	15
	%	1.42
1971	N	27
	%	2.55
1972	N	42
	%	3.96
1973	N	74
	%	6.98
1974	N	190
	%	17.92
1975	N	240
	%	22.64
1976	N	321
	%	30.28
1977	N	68
	%	6.42

General Intelligence Quotients of Students

Table 21 shows that 54.41% of the students represented in the survey had less than an 80 IQ score. This along with other factors, such as, adaptive functioning and academic functioning would generally classify students to be somewhere in the mentally retarded category. Since total number of entries varied between full-scale, verbal and performance IQ scores no indication of the verbal vs. the performance IQ's of the students represented in the survey can be made.

Grade Level Functioning of Students

Examination of Table 22 reveals that the highest percentage of students

are from 0 to 4 years below level in performance in all areas of selected academics, practical studies and the psychomotor areas associated with fine and gross motor skills. In categories of academic functioning, students were found to be 0 to 4 years below level. Functional levels ranged from 87% in general information to 93% in arithmetic reasoning and spelling. In the category of fine motor coordination, gross motor coordination and performance in practical skills were found to be from 0 to 4 years below expected grade level: 75%, 71% and 77% respectively.

Table 21: Student Intelligence Quotients within Specified Ranges

Intelligence Quotient Ranges		Full scale and/or IQ (N = 1009)	Verbal IQ (N = 885)	Performance IQ (N = 882)
Less than 30	N	36	3	4
	X	3.57	.34	.45
30 to 40	N	32	6	5
	X	3.17	.68	.57
40 to 50	N	57	35	39
	X	5.65	3.95	4.42
50 to 60	N	57	58	46
	X	5.65	6.55	5.22
60 to 70	N	136	143	104
	X	13.48	16.16	11.79
70 to 80	N	231	252	157
	X	22.89	28.47	17.80
80 to 90	N	206	192	208
	X	20.42	21.69	23.58
90 to 100	N	161	135	172
	X	15.96	15.25	19.50
100 to 110	N	64	43	101
	X	6.34	4.86	11.45
110 to 120	N	29	18	46
	X	2.87	2.03	5.22

Table 22 Functioning Levels of Students in Selected Categories

Years above or below grade level	Arithmetic Computation (N = 1156)	Arithmetic Reasoning (N = 1153)	Spelling (N = 1156)	General Information (N = 1154)	Word Recognition & Pronunciation (N = 1156)	Comprehensive Reading Achievement (N = 1156)	Fine Motor Coordination (N = 1149)	Gross Motor Coordination (N = 1145)	Performance in Practical Studies (N = 1117)
3.9 or more above	N 6 % .52	7 .61	6 .52	13 1.13	9 .78	10 .87	16 1.39	20 1.75	7 .63
2.0 to 3.9 above	N 17 % 1.47	19 1.65	16 1.38	30 2.60	24 2.08	19 1.64	41 3.57	48 4.19	44 3.94
0.0 to 1.0 above	N 71 % 6.14	60 5.20	55 4.76	112 9.71	73 6.31	67 5.80	232 20.19	260 22.71	200 17.91
0.0 to 1.0 below	N 194 % 16.78	199 17.26	142 12.28	277 24.00	177 15.31	157 13.58	358 31.16	358 31.27	360 32.23
2.0 to 3.9 below	N 289 % 25.00	272 23.59	282 24.39	277 24.00	278 24.05	291 25.17	189 16.45	178 15.55	210 18.80
4.0 or more below	N 579 % 50.09	596 51.69	655 56.66	445 38.56	595 51.47	612 52.94	313 27.24	281 24.54	296 26.50

Grade Placement of Students

Of the students represented in the survey, 17% were found to be attending ungraded classes while 16% were placed in less than the 7th grade. The majority of students, 35%, were placed in the 9th to the 12th grade. Approximately 7% attained the senior year in secondary school placement (see Table 23). It may be recalled that drop-out rates tended to be higher as the students became older and reached the ages of 17, 18 and 19.

Table 23: Specified Ranges of Grade Placement of Students

Ranges of Grade Placement		Count (N = 1117)
Below 7	N	181
	%	16.20
7 - 7.9	N	55
	%	4.92
8 - 8.9	N	107
	%	9.58
9 - 9.9	N	168
	%	15.04
10 - 10.9	N	198
	%	17.73
11 - 11.9	N	140
	%	12.53
12 - 12.9	N	74
	%	6.62
Ungraded	N	194
	%	17.37

Areas of Talent Found Among Students

A measure of cognitive capabilities may be talents students appeared to demonstrate in the estimation of their teachers. In descending order, EMR students showed highest capabilities in the talent categories of mechanics (38%), art (28%) and athletics (24%). TMR students showed very limited talent in any of the talent categories. However, ED/BD students' highest areas of talent were in mechanics (31%), art (23%) and written expression (16%). The LD students showed talent areas to be highest in mechanics (41%), athletics (28%) and art (22%) (see Table 24).

Table 24: Areas of Talent of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Areas of Talent		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Art	N		1	63	5		2		45	62		1	179
	CX		11.11	27.88	35.71		28.57		22.96	22.96		20.00	24.25
	RZ		0.56	35.20	2.79		1.12		25.14	34.64		0.56	100.00
Music	N		1	13	2	1	1	1	16	18	1	1	55
	CX		11.11	5.75	14.29	100.00	14.29	50.00	8.16	6.67	20.00	20.00	7.45
	RZ		1.82	23.64	3.64	1.82	1.82	1.82	29.09	32.72	1.82	1.82	100.00
Writing (written expression)	N		1	10	1		2	1	32	6	1	2	56
	CX		11.11	4.42	7.14		28.57	50.00	16.33	2.22	20.00	40.00	7.59
	RZ		1.79	17.86	1.79		3.57	1.79	57.14	10.71	1.79	3.57	100.00
Mechanics	N	2	4	85			2		61	110	3		267
	CX	66.67	44.44	37.61			28.57		31.12	40.74	60.00		36.18
	RZ	0.75	1.50	31.84			0.75		22.85	41.20	1.12		100.00
Athletics	N	1	2	55	6				42	74		1	181
	CX	33.33	22.22	24.34	42.86				21.43	27.41		20.00	24.53
	RZ	0.55	1.10	30.39	3.31				23.20	40.88		0.55	100.00
Total	N	3	9	226	14	1	7	2	196	270	5	5	738
	CX	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.41	1.22	30.62	1.90	0.14	0.95	0.27	26.56	36.59	0.68	0.68	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Affective Characteristics of Students

When the educator thinks of the affective domain he or she is concerned with internalization within the student of such things as: receiving (attending), responding, valuing, organization and characterization by a value or value complex. Part of receiving is the willingness to receive others and part of responding is the willingness to respond to others. In the Federal definition, behaviors that describe the severely emotionally disturbed child can well fit in these two categories of willingness or ability to receive others and willingness or ability to respond to others. If a child is incapable of these kinds of behaviors over a long period of time and they are noted to a marked degree, then the child is considered to be severely emotionally disturbed.

It is interesting to note that Table 25 shows that all primary handicap categories have some students who may be described as having a severe emotional behavior problem in addition to their primary handicap.

In descending order, and approaching 10% of students within the MR categories are: EMR and TMR showed poor ability to meet demands and expectations of the general society and environment, displayed inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances, and lacked skills to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers. The TMR group results showed them to have poor ability to meet demands and expectations of the general society and environment; poor reality contact and lack of skills to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers; and poor or limited performance of daily life functions. The ED/BD student exhibited most frequently, and in descending order, the following behavior characteristics: poor ability to meet demands and expectations of the general society and environment; poor attitudes toward authority figures; and inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances. LD students generally tended to exhibit poor attitudes towards authority figures; to display inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances; and had non-learning behaviors that could not be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors. Some 17% of LD students, 13% of EMR students, 10% of TMR students, 8% of SMR and ED/BD students were viewed by their teachers as seemingly motivated internally to achieve at school tasks.

Table 25: Moderate to Marked Behaviors of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Behaviors		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Poor attitude toward authority figures	N	1	6	181	35	43	4	1	163	104	2	1	541
	CZ	4.17	10.91	7.76	5.93	7.64	4.30	3.85	10.42	9.94	8.70	2.78	8.52
	RZ	0.18	1.11	33.46	6.47	7.95	0.74	0.18	30.13	19.22	0.37	0.18	100.00
Non-learning behavior that can't be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors	N	1	1	115	37	43	3	4	119	91	2		416
	CZ	4.17	1.82	4.93	6.27	7.64	3.23	15.38	7.61	8.70	8.70		6.55
	RZ	0.24	0.24	27.64	8.89	10.34	0.72	0.96	28.61	21.88	0.48		100.00
Lacks skills to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers	N	2	4	224	64	53	10	2	144	79	2	4	588
	CZ	8.33	7.27	9.61	10.85	9.41	10.75	7.69	9.21	7.75	8.70	11.11	9.26
	RZ	0.34	0.68	38.10	10.88	9.01	1.70	0.34	24.49	13.44	0.34	0.68	100.00
Displays inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances	N	2	4	239	61	49	4		157	93	2	4	615
	CZ	8.33	7.27	10.25	10.34	8.70	4.30		10.04	8.89	8.70	11.11	9.68
	RZ	0.33	0.65	38.86	9.92	7.97	0.65		25.53	15.12	0.33	0.65	100.00
General pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression	N	3	4	156	28	40	9		139	69	1	3	452
	CZ	12.50	7.27	6.69	4.75	7.10	9.68		8.89	6.60	4.35	8.33	7.12
	RZ	0.66	0.88	34.51	6.19	8.85	1.99		30.75	15.27	0.22	0.66	100.00
Tendency to develop physical symptoms, pains or fears associated with personal or school problems	N	1	3	105	23	39	5	2	86	47	2	4	317
	CZ	4.17	5.45	4.50	3.90	6.93	5.38	7.69	5.50	4.49	8.70	11.11	4.99
	RZ	0.32	0.95	33.12	7.26	12.30	1.58	0.63	27.13	14.83	0.63	1.26	100.00
Tendency to exhibit acting-out types of behavior	N	2	6	187	42	46	6	1	144	86		4	524
	CZ	8.33	10.91	8.02	7.12	8.17	6.45	3.85	9.21	8.22		11.11	8.25
	RZ	0.38	1.15	35.69	8.02	8.78	1.15	0.19	27.46	16.41		0.76	100.00
Tendency to be withdrawn	N	2	4	146	39	43	8	1	115	75	2	4	439
	CZ	8.33	7.27	6.26	6.61	7.64	8.60	3.85	7.35	7.17	8.70	11.11	6.91
	RZ	0.46	0.91	33.26	8.88	9.79	1.82	0.23	26.20	17.08	0.46	0.91	100.00
Poor ability to meet demands and expectations of the general society and environment	N	4	6	293	75	55	12	3	166	124	3	5	746
	CZ	16.67	10.91	12.56	12.71	9.77	12.90	11.54	10.61	11.85	13.04	13.89	11.74
	RZ	0.54	0.80	39.28	10.05	7.37	1.61	0.40	22.25	16.62	0.40	0.67	100.00
Poor or limited performance of daily life functions	N		1	175	57	54	11	4	91	42	1	1	437
	CZ		1.82	7.50	9.66	9.59	11.83	15.38	5.82	4.02	4.35	2.78	6.88
	RZ		0.23	40.05	13.04	12.36	2.52	0.92	20.82	9.61	0.23	0.23	100.00

Poor reality contact	N	1	3	201	71	53	7	3	115	57	2	3	516
	C%	4.17	5.45	8.62	12.03	9.41	7.53	11.54	7.35	5.45	8.70	8.33	8.12
	R%	0.19	0.58	38.95	13.76	10.27	1.36	.58	22.29	11.05	0.39	0.58	100.00
Seems internally motivated to achieve at school tasks	N	5	13	310	58	45	14	5	125	179	4	3	761
	C%	20.83	23.64	13.29	9.83	7.99	15.05	19.23	7.99	17.11	17.39	8.33	11.98
	R%	0.66	1.71	40.74	7.62	5.91	1.84	0.66	16.43	23.52	0.53	0.39	100.00
Total	N	24	55	2,332	590	563	93	26	1,564	1,046	23	36	6,352
	C%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	R%	0.38	0.87	36.71	9.29	8.86	1.46	0.41	24.62	16.47	0.36	0.57	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Student Needs in the Community

Most handicapped persons have special needs in the community setting. The conditions and situations under which these persons will live is but one community consideration.

This study revealed that 94% of the students would be living somewhere in a community as opposed to being institutionalized. The kind of living situations which were indicated most often were: living totally independently in community, 35%; living independently in the community, but with assistance from some supportive services, 29%; and living in a half-way home, 14%.

The severely mentally retarded accounted for 62% of those that would have to receive institutional care as would an additional 20% from the emotionally disturbed category.

It seems important to emphasize that 6% of the 14-16 year olds may need to one day receive care in an institution which leaves the remaining handicapped population to be, for the most part, living independently in the community (see Table 26).

Student Educational Needs

One function of the community is to provide education for its youth so that they may become prepared to take on responsibilities of adulthood. Knowledge acquired through the learning process is futile unless at least part of that knowledge has practical application. For the majority of persons this means job preparation, employment and retention of that employment. The focus of this section deals with educational awareness, interest and settings as they pertain to career goal acquisition beyond the K-12 system for handicapped students.

Awareness and Interest in Post-Secondary Offerings

Teachers were asked if they were aware of current VTAE offerings for EEN students. Approximately 54% indicated that they were aware of these offerings. When asked if their students had been provided information about VTAE offerings for EEN students, 69% of their students had not

Table 26 : Best Perceived Place of Residence for Handicapped Students After Completion of the K-12 Educational Program
by Primary Handicap Categories

Place of Residence		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	TOTAL
Totally independent in community	N		5	132			4	1	75	161	3	2	383
	CZ		41.67	29.33			22.22	14.29	34.56	64.92	50.00	33.33	34.54
	RZ		1.31	34.46			1.04	0.26	19.58	42.04	0.78	0.52	100.00
Independently in the community, but with assistance from some supportive services; i.e., an advocate	N	3	5	182	4		3	1	78	48	1	1	326
	CZ	60.00	41.67	40.44	4.71		16.67	14.29	35.94	19.35	16.67	16.67	29.40
	RZ	0.92	1.53	55.83	1.23		0.92	0.31	23.93	14.72	0.31	0.31	100.00
In a halfway home	N		1	67	41	7	4		33	5			158
	CZ		8.33	14.89	48.24	12.73	22.22		15.21	2.02			14.25
	RZ		0.63	42.41	25.95	4.43	2.53		20.89	3.16			100.00
At home	N	2	1	67	33	8	6	3	18	34	2	3	177
	CZ	40.00	8.33	14.89	38.82	14.55	33.33	42.86	8.29	13.71	33.33	50.00	15.96
	RZ	1.13	0.56	37.85	18.64	4.52	3.39	1.69	10.17	19.21	1.13	1.69	100.00
In an institution	N			2	7	40	1	2	13				65
	CZ			.44	8.24	72.73	5.56	28.57	5.99				5.86
	RZ			3.08	10.77	61.54	1.54	3.08	20.00				100.00
Total	N	5	12	450	85	55	18	7	217	248	6	6	1,109
	CZ	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.45	1.08	40.58	7.66	4.96	1.62	0.63	19.57	22.36	0.54	0.54	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

been informed. Students' expressed interest paralleled their information regarding these program offerings in that 31% had expressed interest in attending an institution that would develop his or her occupational skills after completion of the K-12 program. This expressed interest was less, 22% when it came to attending a VTAE institution after high school completion (see Table 27).

Table 27: Student and Teacher Awareness and Student Interest in Post-Secondary Offerings

		Teacher		Students	
		Awareness (N = 1162)	Information (N = 1157)	Interest in Post-Secondary Offerings (N = 1153)	Interest in VTAE Offerings (N = 1128)
Yes	N	631	356	361	246
	Z	54.30	30.77	31.31	21.81
No	N	531	801	792	882
	Z	45.70	69.23	68.69	78.19

Career Goal Perceptions, Training and Interest

When teachers were asked about their perceptions of their students' career goals, 30% had no response to the question. Of the 70% that did respond, the three categories that were chosen most were: Manufacturing (10%); Consumer and Homemaking Education (7%); and Agriculture, Agribusiness and Natural Resources (6%).

The study showed that students had expressed, to their teachers, interest in training in: Construction (14%); Agriculture, Agribusiness and Natural Resources (13%); and Manufacturing (13%).

A total of 36% of the students were found to have received training in at least one of the career goal categories. Predominating were the careers that were either perceived as future goals for the students or the ones that were indicated as the career areas in which students had expressed interest. Teachers indicated these same career areas as the ones in which the students should receive training (see Table 28).

Table 21 : Teacher Perceptions and Student Interest, Training and Recommended Training in Career Goal Categories

Career Goals		Teacher Perceptions of Student Career Goals (N = 1149)	Student Interest in Career Goals (N = 1186)	Student Trained in Career Category (N = 1186)	Teacher Recommended Student Training in Career Category (N = 1186)
Careers not done for pay	N %	35 3.05	60 5.06	36 3.04	55 4.64
Agriculture, Agribusiness & Natural Resources	N %	70 6.09	157 13.24	62 5.23	144 12.14
Business & Office	N %	26 2.26	59 4.97	23 1.94	57 4.81
Communication & Media	N %	10 .87	34 2.87	6 .51	27 2.28
Construction	N %	66 5.74	160 13.49	50 4.22	188 15.85
Consumer & Home- making Education	N %	77 6.70	110 9.27	91 7.67	161 13.58
Ecology & Environment	N %	7 .61	36 3.04	8 .67	33 2.78
Fine Arts & Humanities	N %	17 1.48	54 4.55	20 1.69	38 3.20
Health Occupa- tions	N %	33 2.87	69 5.82	9 .76	59 4.97
Manufacturing	N %	111 9.66	148 12.48	62 5.23	224 18.89
Marine Science	N %	3 .26	15 1.26	1 .08	7 .59
Marketing & Distribution	N %	15 1.31	42 3.54	10 .84	49 4.13
Personal Services	N %	32 2.79	57 4.81	6 .51	77 6.49
Public Service	N %	22 1.91	73 6.16	10 .84	57 4.81
Recreation & Hospitality	N %	21 1.83	52 4.38	20 1.69	53 4.47
Transportation	N %	29 2.52	87 7.34	12 1.01	82 6.91
None of these	N %	243 21.15	381 32.12	639 53.88	276 23.27
No Response	N %	332 28.89			
Responses	N %	817 71.11	1594 134.00	1065 89.79	1587 134.00
Categorical Responses	N %	574 50.00	1213 102.00	428 36.09	1311 110.54

Probable Future Educational Settings

The educational setting for future career goal development were many. Approximately 3% were seen as possible candidates in a college or university setting. In the emotionally disturbed and learning disabled groups, potential candidates ranged from 5 to 7%.

By far the majority of students were seen as probably able to benefit from classes offered by the VTAE system. While 24% of the EMR group was seen as being placed in regular classes and/or regular classes with special consideration, some 47% would need special classes in a VTAE institution. As might be expected this group was seen as being served best in agency assessment centers, 6% and learning and working in a sheltered workshop setting, 13%.

The majority, 77% of the emotionally disturbed students, were seen as being best served by VTAE placement. About 47% could be served in regular classes and/or regular classes with special consideration. Some 21% would require special classes.

The major portion of the learning disabled group, 48%, would need regular classes with some special consideration and 18% would need special classes. About 19% could be served in regular programs (see Table 29).

Recommended Class Sizes

In general, teachers indicated handicapped students would need small class sizes if they were to be more likely to succeed in a school setting. More specifically 90% to 98% of the mentally retarded groups would be more likely to succeed if classes were less than 5 students per class. Close runners-up to these groups were the emotionally disturbed group with 90% and the learning disabled group with 82%.

Specific Educational Needs

Important to the success of handicapped students in an educational setting is consideration and provision for special needs.

In at least 30% of the cases teachers indicated that students are now taught by teachers with an awareness of student disabilities, accepting attitudes and a general knowledge of special education. As additions to these considerations students would need pre-vocational

Table 29 : Best Probable Educational Setting by Which Handicapped Students Could be Served by Primary Handicap Categories

Educational Setting		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Regular class at VTAE institution	N		1	25			1		61	44	1	2	135
	CZ		7.69	5.53			5.56		28.50	18.57	0.83	33.33	12.30
	RZ		0.74	18.52			0.74		45.19	32.59	0.74	1.48	100.00
Regular class at VTAE institution with special consideration	N	1	6	85	1		3		58	114			268
	CZ	20.00	46.15	18.81	1.18		16.67		27.10	48.10			24.41
	RZ	0.26	1.57	22.25	0.26		0.79		15.18	29.84			100.00
Special class in a VTAE institution	N	2	1	213	13	1	4	1	45	43	1		324
	CZ	40.00	7.69	47.12	15.29	1.82	22.22	14.29	21.03	18.14	0.83		29.51
	RZ	0.62	0.31	65.74	4.01	0.31	1.23	0.31	13.89	13.27	0.31		100.00
Attending special school; i.e., for deaf or blind	N		2	2	1	1				1	1		8
	CZ		15.38	0.44	1.18	1.82				0.42	0.83		0.73
	RZ		25.00	25.00	12.50	12.50				12.50	12.50		100.00
An agency assessment center	N	1		29	1				2				33
	CZ	20.00		6.42	1.18				0.93				3.01
	RZ	3.03		87.88	3.03				6.06				100.00
Learning and working in a sheltered workshop	N	1		60	59	4	6	2	12	1	1	1	147
	CZ	20.00		13.27	69.41	7.27	33.33	28.57	5.61	0.42	0.83	16.67	13.39
	RZ	0.68		40.82	40.14	2.72	4.08	1.36	8.16	0.68	0.68	0.68	100.00
Attending a college or university	N		3	1			3	2	14	11	2	3	39
	CZ		23.08	0.22			16.67	28.57	6.54	4.64	1.67	50.00	3.55
	RZ		7.69	2.56			7.69	5.13	35.90	28.21	5.13	7.69	100.00
None of these	N			37	10	49	1	2	22	23			144
	CZ			8.19	11.76	89.09	5.56	28.57	10.28	9.70			13.11
	RZ			25.69	6.94	34.03	0.69	1.39	15.28	15.97			100.00
Total	N	5	13	452	85	55	18	7	214	237	6	6	1,098
	CZ	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.46	1.18	41.17	7.74	5.01	1.64	0.64	19.49	21.58	0.55	0.55	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

Table 30: Student's Primary Handicap and Recommended Class Size

Class Size		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Less than 5 students	N	3	2	243	62	52	8	3	101	135		3	612
	CX	75.00	100.00	90.00	92.54	98.11	66.67	100.00	89.38	82.32		37.50	87.80
	RZ	0.49	0.33	39.71	10.13	8.50	1.31	0.49	16.50	22.06		0.49	100.00
5 students but less than 10 students	N	1		21	3	1	4		12	29	1	2	74
	CX	25.00		7.78	4.48	1.89	33.33		10.62	17.68	100.00	25.00	10.62
	RZ	1.35		28.38	4.05	1.35	5.41		16.22	39.19	1.35	2.70	100.00
10 students but less than 15 students	N			4	1							2	7
	CX			1.48	1.49							25.00	1.00
	RZ			57.14	14.29							28.57	100.00
15 students but less than 20 students	N			2	1								3
	CX			0.74	1.49								0.43
	RZ			66.67	33.33								100.00
20 students but less than 25 students	N											1	1
	CX											12.50	0.14
	RZ											100.00	100.00
Total	N	4	2	270	67	53	12	3	113	164	1	8	697
	CX	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	RZ	0.57	0.29	38.74	9.61	7.60	1.72	0.43	16.21	2.30	0.14	1.15	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

and employability training and follow-up support once they were employed. Approximately 34% would need either general counseling services or a specialized counselor working with them on a regular basis.

Not seen as applying in most cases would be the provisions for public transportation, private/special transportation, equipment modification, classes without cost, the location of the learning institution near the student's residence and a place to rest part of the day.

Learning Modalities

In the majority of cases students were seen as learning best through the audio-visual modalities. In from 16% to 27% the tactual modality was given important consideration.

Table 31: Provisions That Apply, or Would Apply to Students in a School Setting

Educational Provisions		Presently Provided	Would Need	Doesn't Apply
Teacher awareness of students disability	N %	659 55.56	461 38.87	66 5.56
Teachers with accepting attitudes	N %	601 50.67	478 40.30	107 9.02
Public transportation	N %	298 25.13	206 17.37	682 57.50
Private/special transportation	N %	143 12.06	93 7.84	950 80.10
Equipment modification	N %	57 4.81	69 5.82	1060 89.38
Pre-vocational training	N %	327 27.57	489 41.23	370 31.20
Employability training	N %	198 16.69	591 49.83	397 33.47
Follow-up support provided once employed	N %	115 9.70	561 47.30	510 43.00
Classes without cost	N %	197 16.61	297 25.04	692 58.35
Teachers with a general knowledge of special education	N %	437 36.85	462 38.95	287 24.20
Institution located near student's residence	N %	203 17.12	216 18.21	767 64.67
General counseling services	N %	301 25.38	399 33.64	486 40.98
A specialized counselor working with the student regularly	N %	178 15.01	413 34.82	595 50.17
A place to rest part of the day	N %	66 5.56	48 4.05	1072 90.39

Note. Total N per row equals 1,186.

Table 32 : Learning Modalities of Students by Primary Handicap Categories

Learning Modalities		D	HH	EMR	TMR	SMR	OH	OHI	ED/BD	LD	S/L	VH	Total
Tactual	N	1	3	215	39	37	3	2	68	128	2	3	501
	C%	11.11	14.29	20.40	27.08	33.33	9.38	22.22	15.45	24.11	11.76	27.27	21.06
	R%	0.20	0.60	42.91	7.78	7.39	0.60	0.40	13.57	25.55	0.40	0.60	100.00
Auditory	N	1		208		17	9	3	100	101	4	3	446
	C%	11.11		19.73		15.32	28.13	33.33	22.73	19.02	23.53	27.27	18.75
	R%	0.22		46.64		3.81	2.02	0.67	22.42	22.65	0.90	0.67	100.00
Visual	N	5	12	222	47	42	6	2	104	85	5	3	533
	C%	55.56	57.14	21.06	32.64	37.84	18.75	22.22	23.64	16.01	29.41	27.27	22.40
	R%	0.94	2.25	41.65	8.82	7.88	1.13	0.38	19.51	15.95	0.94	0.56	100.00
Audio/Visual	N	2	6	409	58	15	14	2	168	217	6	2	899
	C%	22.22	28.57	38.80	40.28	13.51	43.75	22.22	38.18	40.87	35.29	18.18	37.79
	R%	0.22	0.67	45.49	6.45	1.67	1.56	0.22	18.69	24.14	0.67	0.22	100.00
Total	N	9	21	1,054	144	111	32	9	440	531	17	11	2,379
	C%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	R%	0.38	23.79	44.30	6.05	4.67	39.18	0.38	18.50	22.32	0.71	0.46	100.00

Note. Multiple responses occur, therefore column totals are not representative of the primary handicap ratio established in prior tables.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARIZATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the design and methodology of the study, conclusions drawn from the study and recommendations pursuant to meeting the needs of handicapped adolescents indentified in the study.

Review of Preceding Chapters

In Chapter I the problem statement revealed that the study would address itself to the identification of the cognitive, psychomotor and affective characteristics of handicapped students 14 to 21 years of age, their perceived needs in the community and in future education and training in Wisconsin. A 20% sample of these students' teachers were surveyed using a mailed, machine-scoreable instrument distributed on a state-wide basis. This instrument had been validated by professional educators who represented the three district educational systems in Wisconsin. Reliability testing was accomplished by using test-retest procedures under the surveillance of two directors of special education from the K-12 system.

In Chapter II the findings of the study were presented in some detail. In general, students were found to be mostly male, English speaking, Caucasians having intelligence quotients below 80. They were generally below level in grade placement and achievement levels in specified subject areas. Their career goals as indicated by their teachers lay in the areas of agriculture, manufacturing, consumer and homemaking education and construction. Teachers projected to say that most of their students would live in communities and would be able to benefit from programs offered through a VTAE institution. The primary handicaps that predominated among the students were: mental retardation, emotional disturbance and learning disabilities with impairment indicated as being neurological in nature. Although defined in these three major categories, for reimbursement purposes, the implication was that most had secondary disabilities that cut across all handicap categories. Emotional disturbance and difficulties with language were found in varying degrees among

the mentally retarded and learning disabled groups. If served most beneficially in a VTAE institution these young adults would need instruction using all learning modalities in an environment that was restricted to small numbers of students.

Conclusions

Recent state and Federal legislation has provided laws relating to the education of handicapped individuals. But, basic education without consideration for or preparation toward career goal objectives serves little purpose. Therefore, it can be *concluded* that training in vocational education programs is clearly needed if handicapped youth and adults are to be served most effectively through educational efforts.

Recommendations

The subsequent recommendations are followed by a rationale for each of the recommendations stated.

Recommendation 1

That vocational education programs be planned and implemented to accommodate all types of handicapped students, particularly those that are categorized as being mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled, at the secondary and post-secondary levels of instruction.

Statement. The three handicapped categories named above comprise approximately 75% of the state's student population between the ages of 14-21. Teachers have indicated that 66% of all handicapped students could benefit from regular classes, regular classes with special consideration or special classes within a VTAE institution. They also indicated that in 28% of the cases, prevocational training had been provided and 41% of the students would need such training. Employability training was provided 17% of the students while 50% would need this kind of training.

Recommendation 2

That vocational, technical teachers take course work to learn how to teach adult handicapped students in the VTAE system.

Statement. The study indicated that 37% of the handicapped students were provided with teachers with a general knowledge of special education

and 38% of the students would need such teachers. It was also indicated that 51% of the teachers had accepting attitudes of the students they taught and that 40% of the students would need teachers with accepting attitudes.

Recommendation 3

That institutions of higher education provide course work to vocational teachers to prepare them to teach handicapped persons.

Statement. Courses in special education are not generally provided to vocational teachers within the university system. Generally, the special education courses focus on elementary youngsters while there is a need to train teachers to serve the adolescent and adult handicapped students.

Recommendation 4

That counselors take course work especially addressed to serving handicapped students within secondary and post-secondary institutions of learning.

Statement. Teachers expressed that specialized counselors were working with 15% of the handicapped students while 35% would need such services after completion of their programs at the K-12 level.

Recommendation 5

That administrative personnel become knowledgeable about handicapped students.

Statement. It follows that to provide the proper educational climate to meet the needs of handicapped students, administrators will, out of necessity, have to become educationally knowledgeable about them. Meeting needs will encompass not only the providing of well-trained personnel to serve these students and proper or modified equipment, but considerations having to do with course length and competency levels required to make these students employable will become another serious consideration.

Recommendation 6

That efforts be made to provide for articulation between the secondary and post-secondary levels of instruction as vocational educators and special educators attempt to meet the educational needs of handicapped students.

handicapped students.

Statement. Shown in the study was a 46% lack of awareness on the part of secondary teachers as to the availability of VTAE offerings for handicapped students. Some 69% of the students themselves were not found to be aware of offering provided for them by the VTAE system. While some students were indicated as having received instruction in career areas it cannot be concluded that student interest and ability were considered in career goal choices.

Recommendation 7

That accepting attitudes toward all handicapped persons be developed, among educators and within communities in general, so that these persons can acquire skills, gain employment and retain employment.

Statement. Approximately 95% of all categories of handicapped students will be living in communities rather than being cared for in institutions. Some 66% of the handicapped students were indicated as possibly being able to benefit from instruction within VTAE institutions and 40% of these students would need teachers who would have accepting attitudes.

REFERENCES

Federal Register, 8 September 1976, 41 (175).

Laws of Wisconsin relating to public schools through November 20, 1974.
Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1974.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Division of Handicapped
Children, School District Plan, Part A, Annual Report on Special
Education Programs for the Handicapped, 1975-76.

Appendix A

INSTRUMENT VALIDATORS

- Ms. Beth Anderson, Human Development Coordinator, Fox Valley Technical Institute
- Dr. Beverly Bliss, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Ms. Claudia Bodway, Psychologist, Mid-State Technical Institute
- Mr. Victor J. Contrucci, Program Administrator, Mentally Handicapped, Department of Public Instruction
- Dr. Corinne Crutcher, Special Education Department, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
- Ms. Barbara Dougherty, Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Ms. Elaine M. Franken, School Psychologist, Racine Unified School District
- Mr. John Gugerty, Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Mr. Gary Holloway, Data Coordinator, Department of Public Instruction
- Ms. Mary Jensen, School Psychologist, Racine Unified School District
- Dr. Nancy Kane, Professor, Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Dr. Roger Lambert, Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Dr. Paul Lustig, Professor, Behavioral Disabilities, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Mrs. Rose Nelson, Nicolet College and Technical Institute
- Ms. Stephanie Petska, Administration Services Assistant, Department of Public Instruction
- Dr. Grant Rehder, Director Special Education, Oshkosh Public Schools
- Dr. Russ Retterer, Director Special Education, Marathon County
- Mr. Preston Smetzer, Special Needs Consultant, Department of Public Instruction
- Dr. George Stockton, Special Education Department, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
- Mr. Lester Stram, Director, Madison Opportunity Center
- Dr. Betty Ross Thomson, Department of Public Instruction
- Dr. Harold Thorpe, Special Education Department, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

Dr. Lloyd Tindall, Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Mr. James Urness, Special Needs Consultant, Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education

Mr. Jose Vasquez, Specialist, Special Needs Students, Waukesha County Technical Institute

Appendix B
 PARTICIPATING LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS
 From Within
 WISCONSIN'S VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL AND ADULT EDUCATION DISTRICTS

- VTAE District # 1: Alma Center, Boyceville, Cadott, Colfax, Eau Claire, Fall Creek, Menomonie, Mondovi, Neillsville, Pepin, River Falls, Strum-Eleva, Thorp
- VTAE District # 2: Cochrane-Fountain City, Galesville-Trempealeau, Holmen, Independence, LaCrosse, Mauston, Onalaska, Tomah
- VTAE District # 3: Barneveld, Bloomington, Boscobel, Dodgeville, Gays Mills, Gratiot-South Wayne, Hazel Green, Iowa-Grant, Platteville, Richland Center, Wauzeka
- VTAE District # 4: Fort Atkinson, Jefferson, Lake Mills, Lodi, Madison, Middleton, Monona Grove, Oregon, Portage, Spring Green, Stoughton, Waterloo, Westfield
- VTAE District # 5: Albany, Evansville, Janesville
- VTAE District # 6: Delavan-Darien UHS, Racine Unified, Salem UHS, Walworth UHS, Waterford UHS, Wilmot UHS
- VTAE District # 8: Oconomowoc
- VTAE District # 9: Brown Deer, Cudahy, Fredonia, Glendale-Nicolet UHS, Greendale, Mequon-Thiensville, Oak Creek, South Milwaukee, Wauwatosa
- VTAE District # 10: Beaver Dam, Berlin, Campbellsport, Kewaskum, New Holstein, Waupun
- VTAE District # 11: Plymouth, Sheboygan, Valders
- VTAE District # 12: Appleton, Clintonville, Hilbert, Hortonville, Iola-Scandinavia, Kaukauna, Menasha, Neenah, Seymour, Shiocton, Wautoma, Winneconne
- VTAE District # 13: Bonduel, Brussels-Southern Door, Denmark, Florence Goodman, Green Bay, Kewaunee, Lena, Luxemburg-Casco, Pulaski, Shawano, Washington Island
- VTAE District # 14: Adams-Friendship, Almond, Marshfield, Pittsville, Stevens Point

VTAE District # 15: Bowler, Loyal, Merrill, Mosinee, Wittenberg-
Birnamwood

VTAE District # 16: Laona, Minocqua-Lakeland UHS, Rhinelander

VTAE District # 17: Amery, Ashland, Barron, Birchwood, Chetek,
Cumberland, Grantsburg, Hayward, Hudson, Hurley,
Ladysmith, Maple, Mellen, New Richmond, Shell Lake,
Spooner, Superior, Webster

Total school districts with full participation: 128 out of 382 possible 33.5%.

WISCONSIN VOCATIONAL STUDIES CENTER

ANALYSIS OF RELIABILITY FOR
EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IDENTIFICATION INSTRUMENT
RELIABILITY BY QUESTION

QUESTION 1	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 2	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 3	BASIC RELIABILITY = 90.123 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 4	BASIC RELIABILITY = 92.593 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 96.154 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 5	BASIC RELIABILITY = 91.358 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 6	BASIC RELIABILITY = 93.827 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 7	BASIC RELIABILITY = 95.062 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION 8	BASIC RELIABILITY = 87.654 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 91.026 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 9	BASIC RELIABILITY = 92.593 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 93.750 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 10	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 11	BASIC RELIABILITY = 97.531 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION 12	BASIC RELIABILITY = 88.889 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 96.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 13	BASIC RELIABILITY = 83.951 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 83.951 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 14	BASIC RELIABILITY = 80.247 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 80.247 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 15	BASIC RELIABILITY = 82.716 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 83.750 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 16	BASIC RELIABILITY = 72.840 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 72.840 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 17	BASIC RELIABILITY = 81.481 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 81.481 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 18	BASIC RELIABILITY = 82.716 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 82.716 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 19	BASIC RELIABILITY = 79.012 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 79.012 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 20	BASIC RELIABILITY = 74.074 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 75.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 21	BASIC RELIABILITY = 76.543 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 79.487 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 22	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 98.765 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION 23	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 98.765 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION 24	BASIC RELIABILITY = 95.062 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 95.062 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION 25	BASIC RELIABILITY = 92.593 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 92.593 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION 26	BASIC RELIABILITY = 56.790 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 80.702 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 27	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 28	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 29	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 30	BASIC RELIABILITY = 97.531 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 31	BASIC RELIABILITY = 95.062 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 32	BASIC RELIABILITY = 96.296 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 33	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 34	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 35	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 36	BASIC RELIABILITY = 95.062 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 37	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 38	BASIC RELIABILITY = 97.531 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 39	BASIC RELIABILITY = 97.531 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 40	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 41	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 42	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 43	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 98.592 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION 44	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 45	BASIC RELIABILITY = 97.531 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 46	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION 47	BASIC RELIABILITY = 100.000 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0

63

QUESTION162	BASIC RELIABILITY = 97.531 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 98.750 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION163	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION164	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION165	BASIC RELIABILITY = 98.765 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 100.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION166	BASIC RELIABILITY = 81.481 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 94.286 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION167	BASIC RELIABILITY = 87.654 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 92.208 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION168	BASIC RELIABILITY = 90.123 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 94.805 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION169	BASIC RELIABILITY = 85.185 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 88.462 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION170	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 94.595 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION171	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 95.890 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION172	BASIC RELIABILITY = 87.654 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 94.667 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION173	BASIC RELIABILITY = 88.889 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 96.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION174	BASIC RELIABILITY = 91.358 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 98.667 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION175	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 94.595 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION176	BASIC RELIABILITY = 90.123 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 94.805 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION177	BASIC RELIABILITY = 87.654 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 97.260 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION178	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 92.105 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION179	BASIC RELIABILITY = 85.185 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 93.243 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION180	BASIC RELIABILITY = 81.481 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 82.500 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION181	BASIC RELIABILITY = 85.185 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 86.250 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION182	BASIC RELIABILITY = 83.951 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 85.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 1
QUESTION183	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 87.500 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION184	BASIC RELIABILITY = 88.889 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 90.000 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION185	BASIC RELIABILITY = 86.420 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 87.500 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION186	BASIC RELIABILITY = 80.247 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 81.250 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION187	BASIC RELIABILITY = 85.185 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 87.342 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION188	BASIC RELIABILITY = 81.481 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 84.615 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION189	BASIC RELIABILITY = 88.889 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 91.139 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION190	BASIC RELIABILITY = 87.654 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 91.926 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0
QUESTION191	BASIC RELIABILITY = 79.012 PERCENT	ADJUSTED RELIABILITY = 81.013 PER CENT	NUMBER OUT OF RANGE = 0

WISCONSIN VOCATIONAL STUDIES CENTER

ANALYSIS OF RELIABILITY FOR

EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IDENTIFICATION INSTRUMENT

COMPOSITE AVERAGE RELIABILITY FOR ALL QUESTIONS 92.3534 PER CENT

COMPOSITE AVERAGE ADJUSTED RELIABILITY FOR ALL QUESTIONS 95.4637 PER CENT

Appendix D

State of Wisconsin

BOARD OF VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL & ADULT EDUCATION

EUGENE LEHRMANN State Director



1

After completing an instrument for each student you are responsible for educationally, return all completed forms to your building coordinator.

Disability - a condition or impairment of a physical, mental or emotional nature that would make it impractical for a person to pursue a specific occupation.

96

15. Indicate the date of the last intelligence test administered: →

TEST DATE		
MONTH	DAY	YEAR
☐ JAN		
☐ FEB		
☐ MAR	0 0 0	
☐ APRIL	1 1 1	
☐ MAY	2 2 2	
☐ JUNE	3 3 3	
☐ JULY	4 4 4	
☐ AUG	5 5 5	
☐ SEPT	6 6 6	
☐ OCT	7 7 7	
☐ NOV	8 8 8	
☐ DEC	9 9 9	

☐ Given before 1970

☐ Never given

SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

16. Indicate student grade placement or group of grade placements that apply:

- ☐ Below 7 ☐ 10-10.9
☐ 7-7.9 ☐ 11-11.9
☐ 8-8.9 ☐ 12-12.9
☐ 9-9.9 ☐ Non-graded

IN YOUR ESTIMATION, THIS STUDENT COMPARED TO OTHER STUDENTS HIS OR HER SAME AGE IS RATED 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 OR 6 IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF ACHIEVEMENT: NOTE:

- 1 = 3.9 or more years above grade level
 2 = 2.0 to 3.9 years above grade level
 3 = 0.0 to 1.9 years above grade level
 4 = 0.0 to 1.9 years below grade level
 5 = 2.0 to 3.9 years below grade level
 6 = 4.0 or more years below grade level

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 17. Arithmetic Computation | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 18. Arithmetic Reasoning | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 19. Spelling | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 20. General Information | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 21. Word Recognition and Pronunciation | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 22. Comprehensive Reading Achievement | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 23. Fine Motor Coordination | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 24. Gross Motor Coordination | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 25. Performance in practical studies
i.e., shop, homemaking, mechanics | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |

26. Are you aware of current VTAE offerings for EEN students? (See definitions on page 1) ☐ Yes ☐ No
27. Has this student been provided information about VTAE offerings for EEN students? ☐ Yes ☐ No
28. Has this student expressed interest in attending an institution that would develop his/her occupational skills after he/she completes the K-12 program? ☐ Yes ☐ No
29. Has the student expressed an interest in attending a VTAE institution in this state after completion of the K-12 program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

COPYRIGHT © 1977
 EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IDENTIFICATION INSTRUMENT
 WISCONSIN VOCATIONAL STUDIES CENTER
 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON

Career Goal Definitions

(Please realize this list does not include the highest or lowest skills in the occupations listed below.)

- a. CAREERS NOT DONE FOR PAY such as homemaker, traveler, volunteer, etc.
- b. AGRICULTURE, AGRIBUSINESS AND NATURAL RESOURCES such as botanists, cattlemen, crop scientists, dairy farmers, gardeners and groundskeepers, horticulturists, lumbermen, nurserymen and landscapers, soil scientists, zoologists.
- c. BUSINESS AND OFFICE such as accountants, bookkeeping machine operators, economists, executives, legal secretaries and stenographers, shorthand reporters, systems analysts, typists.
- d. COMMUNICATION AND MEDIA such as book editors, broadcast technicians, commercial and industrial photographers, freelance writers, literary agents, magazine editorial workers, newspaper editors, press photographers, proofreaders, reporters.
- e. CONSTRUCTION such as asbestos and insulation workers, bricklayers, building contractors, carpenters, cement masons, civil engineers, electricians, glaziers, iron and steel workers, lathers, painters, plumbers and pipefitters, roofers, structural iron workers.
- f. CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION such as bakers, bus boys, cleaning and dyeing workers, dieticians, fashion designers, home economists, household workers, interior designers, sewing machine operators, upholsterers.
- g. ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT such as geographers, meteorologists, pest control operators, wildlife managers.
- h. FINE ARTS AND HUMANITIES such as actors, anthropologists, cartoonists, composers, dancers, historians, models, performing musicians, playwrights, radio and television announcers, script writers, translators, and interpreters.
- i. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS such as anesthetists, chiropractors, dental assistants, dental hygienists, dentists, hospital attendants, licensed practical nurses, medical lab assistants, opticians, pediatricians, pharmacists, physicians, psychologists, registered nurses.
- j. MANUFACTURING such as aerospace engineers, air conditioning and refrigeration engineers, atomic energy technicians, boilermakers, draftsmen, electronic technicians, factory inspectors, foundry workers, machinists, millwrights, nuclear engineers, shipbuilders, tool & die makers, welders.
- k. MARINE SCIENCE such as divers, oceanographers, marine biologists, marine geologists.
- l. MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION such as advertising account executives, advertising copywriters, automobile salesmen, buyers, delivery route salesmen, department store salespeople, display workers, florists, general merchandise salespeople, insurance agents, marketing research workers, purchasing agents, securities salesmen.
- m. PERSONAL SERVICES such as barbers, beauticians, funeral directors, parking attendants.
- n. PUBLIC SERVICE such as armed forces, athletic coaches, city managers, city planners, clergymen, criminologists, detectives, elementary school teachers, fire fighters, high school teachers, lawyers, librarians, psychiatrists, social workers.
- o. RECREATION AND HOSPITALITY such as airline stewardesses, athletic coaches, camp counselors, cooks and chefs, hotel managers, professional athletes, recreation workers, travel agency workers.
- p. TRANSPORTATION such as airline dispatchers, air traffic controllers, airline pilots, flight engineers, helicopter pilots, local bus drivers, longshoremen and stevedores, merchant seamen, railroad brakemen, safety engineers, taxicab drivers, traffic managers.
- q. NONE OF THESE

STUDENT'S CAREER GOAL (Questions 30-33)

30. As you perceive your student's future, which ONE major career category listed below is closest to your student's career goal? (Refer to career definitions on page 2)

- ☐ a. Careers not done for pay
☐ b. Agriculture, Agribusiness and Natural Resources
☐ c. Business and Office
☐ d. Communication and Media
☐ e. Construction
☐ f. Consumer and Homemaking Education
☐ g. Ecology and Environment
☐ h. Fine Arts and Humanities
☐ i. Health Occupations
☐ j. Manufacturing
☐ k. Marine Science
☐ l. Marketing and Distribution
☐ m. Personal Services
☐ n. Public Service
☐ o. Recreation and Hospitality
☐ p. Transportation
☐ q. None of these

IN YOUR ESTIMATION, THIS STUDENT AFTER COMPLETION OF THE K-12 PROGRAM (Questions 34-35)

34. Could probably be served best by: (Mark one only)

- ☐ Attending regular classes at a VTAE institution
☐ Attending regular classes at a VTAE institution with special instructional considerations
☐ Attending special classes in a VTAE institution - i.e., EEN students
☐ Attending a special school; i.e., for deaf or blind
☐ An agency assessment center
☐ Learning and working in a sheltered workshop
☐ Attending a college or a university
☐ None of these

35. Would best live: (Mark one only)

- ☐ Totally independent in the community
☐ Independently in the community, but with assistance from some supportive services; i.e., an advocate
☐ In a halfway home
☐ At home
☐ In an institution

36. Indicate the provisions that apply and/or would apply to this EEN student in his/her school setting: (Leave blank if neither choice applies)

- | | Presently provided | Would need |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Teacher awareness of student's disability | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Teachers with accepting attitudes | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Public transportation | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Private/special transportation | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Equipment modification | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. Pre-vocational training | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. Employability training | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. Follow-up support provided once employed | ☐ | ☐ |
| i. Classes without cost | ☐ | ☐ |
| j. Teachers with a general knowledge of special education | ☐ | ☐ |
| k. Institution located near student's residence | ☐ | ☐ |
| l. General counseling services | ☐ | ☐ |
| m. A specified counselor working with the student regularly | ☐ | ☐ |
| n. A place to rest part of the day | ☐ | ☐ |

31. Student's expressed interest in which category/categories

- ☐ a.
☐ b.
☐ c.
☐ d.
☐ e.
☐ f.
☐ g.
☐ h.
☐ i.
☐ j.
☐ k.
☐ l.
☐ m.
☐ n.
☐ o.
☐ p.
☐ q.

32. Has received formal training in which category/categories

- ☐ a.
☐ b.
☐ c.
☐ d.
☐ e.
☐ f.
☐ g.
☐ h.
☐ i.
☐ j.
☐ k.
☐ l.
☐ m.
☐ n.
☐ o.
☐ p.
☐ q.

33. You recommend formal training in which category/categories

- ☐ a.
☐ b.
☐ c.
☐ d.
☐ e.
☐ f.
☐ g.
☐ h.
☐ i.
☐ j.
☐ k.
☐ l.
☐ m.
☐ n.
☐ o.
☐ p.
☐ q.

36. (cont.) Indicate any further needs you perceive for this student's success in a VTAE institution if he/she is a potential candidate:

- 1:
2:
3:

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE AREA AT LEFT

37. This student's primary handicap is labeled as:

- ☐ a. Deaf
☐ b. Hard of hearing
☐ c. Educable mentally retarded
☐ d. Trainable mentally retarded
☐ e. Severely mentally retarded (Sub-trainable)
☐ f. Orthopedically handicapped
☐ g. Other health impaired
☐ h. Emotionally disturbed and/or behavior disordered
☐ i. Learning disabled
☐ j. Speech/language impaired
☐ k. Visually handicapped

38. This student has more than one handicap.

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

39. If student has multiple handicaps indicate other handicapping area/areas involved using the code from 37 above.

a b c d e f g h i j k

40. Indicate the type of program the student is enrolled in:

- ☐ Deaf/hard of hearing
☐ Educable mentally retarded
☐ Trainable mentally retarded
☐ Sub-trainable mentally retarded
☐ Physically handicapped/Other health impaired
☐ Multiple handicapped
☐ Emotionally disturbed/Behavior disordered
☐ Learning disability
☐ Speech/language impaired
☐ Blind/Visually impaired
☐ Regular programming with supportive services
☐ Regular programming
☐ None of the above

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WITH A YES OR NO RESPONSE:

- YES NO STUDENT IS OR HAS:
41. ☒ ☐ Blind
42. ☒ ☐ Been blind since birth
43. ☒ ☐ A Braille reader
44. ☒ ☐ Impaired visual activity with corrective device
45. ☒ ☐ Peripheral field impairment
46. ☒ ☐ Central vision impairment
47. ☒ ☐ Deaf
(A decibel loss in the better ear in the range of
48. ☒ ☐ 20-30 db
49. ☒ ☐ 30-40 db
50. ☒ ☐ 40-60 db
51. ☒ ☐ 60-75 db
52. ☒ ☐ 75 db plus)

STUDENT IS OR HAS:

53. ☒ ☐ A signer
54. ☒ ☐ A lip reader
55. ☒ ☐ Verbal communicator
56. ☒ ☐ Been orthopedically impaired since birth
57. ☒ ☐ Orthopedically impaired due to accident
58. ☒ ☐ Orthopedically impaired through disease process
59. ☒ ☐ To use crutches
60. ☒ ☐ To use a wheelchair
61. ☒ ☐ To use other orthopedic appliance
62. ☒ ☐ Ambulatory
63. ☒ ☐ A heart condition
64. ☒ ☐ A kidney problem
65. ☒ ☐ Asthma
66. ☒ ☐ Sickle Cell Anemia
67. ☒ ☐ Hemophilia
68. ☒ ☐ Epilepsy
69. ☒ ☐ Leukemia
70. ☒ ☐ Diabetes
71. ☒ ☐ Liver problems
72. ☒ ☐ Chronic anemia
73. ☒ ☐ High blood pressure
74. ☒ ☐ Neurological impairment

STUDENT IS OR HAS some degree of disability

75. ☒ ☐ Listening in:
76. ☒ ☐ Thinking
77. ☒ ☐ Speaking
78. ☒ ☐ Reading
79. ☒ ☐ Writing (i.e., written expression)
80. ☒ ☐ Spelling
81. ☒ ☐ Calculating
82. ☒ ☐ Visual perception

STUDENT IS OR HAS:

83. ☒ ☐ Poor sentence structure
84. ☒ ☐ Ability to readily understand what is said
(i.e., receptive language impairment)
85. ☒ ☐ Able to express himself/herself adequately
(i.e., expressive language impairment)
86. ☒ ☐ An adequate vocabulary for age
87. ☒ ☐ A language impairment mainly due to his or her
cultural background
88. ☒ ☐ A stuttering condition
89. ☒ ☐ Impaired articulation; i.e., lisp, tongue tied
90. ☒ ☐ A voice disorder
91. ☒ ☐ Delayed speech

STUDENT HAS Either missing or suffers the loss or impaired use of the right:

- YES NO
92. ☒ ☐ fingers
93. ☒ ☐ arm
94. ☒ ☐ foot
95. ☒ ☐ leg

STUDENT HAS Either missing or suffers the loss or impaired use of the left:

96. ☒ ☐ fingers
97. ☒ ☐ arm
98. ☒ ☐ foot
99. ☒ ☐ leg

STUDENT IS OR HAS BEEN Able to learn the best through which of the following modalities?

100. ☒ ☐ Tactual
101. ☒ ☐ Auditory
102. ☒ ☐ Visual
103. ☒ ☐ Audio/Visual

STUDENT IS More likely to be successful in a school setting if his/her class size is:

104. ☒ ☐ less than 5 students
105. ☒ ☐ 5 students, but less than 10 students
106. ☒ ☐ 10 students, but less than 15 students
107. ☒ ☐ 15 students, but less than 20 students
108. ☒ ☐ 20 students, but less than 25 students

STUDENT IS talented in:

109. ☒ ☐ Art
110. ☒ ☐ Music
111. ☒ ☐ Writing
112. ☒ ☐ Mechanics
113. ☒ ☐ Athletics

IN YOUR OPINION, THIS STUDENT AS COMPARED TO OTHER STUDENTS OF HIS OR HER SAME AGE EXHIBITS THE FOLLOWING BEHAVIORS: (Indicate 1, 2, or 3)

1 = Hardly ever or never

2 = Moderate degree over a long period of time

3 = Marked degree over a long period of time

114. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has a poor attitude toward authority figures
115. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is non-learning in behavior that can't be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors
116. ☒ ☐ ☐ Lacks the skills to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers
117. ☒ ☐ ☐ Displays inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances
118. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has a general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression
119. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has a tendency to develop physical symptoms, pains or fears associated with personal or school problems
120. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has a tendency to exhibit acting-out types of behavior
121. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has a tendency to be withdrawn
122. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has poor ability to meet demands and expectations of the general society and environment
123. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has poor or limited performance of daily life functions
124. ☒ ☐ ☐ Has poor reality contact
125. ☒ ☐ ☐ Student seems to be internally motivated to achieve at school tasks